

South Dakota State University

Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1971

Occupational Aspirations and Expectations of Seminary Students

William Mastin Cross

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd>



Part of the [Rural Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cross, William Mastin, "Occupational Aspirations and Expectations of Seminary Students" (1971). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 5288.
<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/5288>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

12

OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS
OF SEMINARY STUDENTS

BY

WILLIAM MASTIN CROSS

A thesis submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Doctor of Philosophy, Major in
Rural Sociology, South Dakota
State University

1971.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

OF SEMINARY STUDENTS

This thesis is approved as a creditable and independent investigation by a candidate for the degree, Doctor of Philosophy, and is acceptable as meeting the thesis requirements for this degree. Acceptance of this thesis does not imply that the conclusions reached by the candidate are necessarily the conclusions of the major department.

OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS
OF SEMINARY STUDENTS

Abstract

WILLIAM MASTIN CROSS

Under the supervision of Professor Robert M. Dimit

This study was developed as the result of a long-term interest in occupational choice. The basic problem of the study was the nature of the relation between influences perceived by seminarians on their occupational choice, and their occupational specialization. The basic objective was to explore the nature and extent of this relation.

Literature was reviewed dealing with the relation of reference groups to classical and contemporary theory. Literature related to reference theory dealing with medical students and ministerial specialization was also dealt with.

The basic theoretical model used was that of Merton. He related reference group theory to the occupational choice process of medical students, using empirical research. The frame of reference selected for the study was that of Mead and Sherif. Research hypotheses were derived from the review of literature.

A questionnaire was developed, drawing on instruments used by Merton and Scherer. A number of individuals knowledgeable about various ministerial occupations were used as a panel to develop questions dealing with these specializations. This instrument was pretested on 52 preseminary students at Valparaiso University in February 1970. The questionnaire was evaluated and refined as a result of this test.

Respondents consisted of students in four Chicago area seminaries, three in the St. Louis area, and two in Northern Indiana.

In April 1970, 366 seminarians were interviewed. They completed the questionnaire in a group setting. The data collected constituted the basis for analysis.

The chi-square test was selected, with level of significance set at the .05 level. Relationships tested were primarily two categories of occupational specialization. The aspirational category dealt with those specializations in which seminarians would like to work. The expectational category included specializations they expected to be performing. Research hypotheses were put into null form for testing.

Conclusions were as follows:

1. There was significant association between influences perceived as significant by seminarians, and their occupational specialization aspirations.
2. There was significant association between influences perceived as significant by seminarians, and their occupational specialization expectations.
3. There was significant association between socioeconomic factors and occupational specialization aspirations.
4. There was significant association between socioeconomic factors and occupational specialization expectations.
5. There was significant association between socioeconomic factors and influences perceived by seminarians as significant.
6. There was significant association between socioeconomic factors.

The only reference person of more than slight influence on the individual's decision to enter seminary was the minister.

But reference motivations, particularly divine call and concern for social and community problems, were perceived as strongly influencing this decision. While doctrinal liberals, conservatives and moderates gave strong response to traditional ministries, conservatives gave these greater emphasis. Liberals scored higher for new ministries as well as specializations of the traditional parish ministry. Traditional ministries are general, undifferentiated parish ministries. New ministries are recent, non-congregation specializations, such as ministries to addicts and to people living in high-rise apartments. Specializations of the parish ministry are found in parish-centered counseling and religious education specializations. The overwhelming selection of traditional parish ministries reflects the actual positions available for employment of graduating seminarians.

The research was limited by the fact that not all denominations were represented. Generalizations must be limited to the central Midwest. This study dealt with impressions of those undergoing training for a profession rather than those actually working within it. Occupational aspirations and expectations may change considerably once seminarians actually enter their occupation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses gratitude and thanks to the following, who assisted the author in this dissertation:

To Dr. Robert M. Dimit, thesis advisor, and to Professor Howard M. Sauer, Chairman of the Rural Sociology Department, for their counsel and guidance in the development of the dissertation

To Dr. W. Lee Tucker, for assistance with statistical procedures.

To Dr. Richard Knudten, Dr. Roy Martinson, Dr. Paul Chalfant, Dr. Jeff Johnson, and Prof. Nancy Sederberg of the Sociology Department of Valparaiso University, for assistance in developing the questionnaire.

To Dr. Ross Scherer of the Sociology Department of Loyola University of Chicago, for help in developing and refining the scope of the project.

To Dr. Douglas Lewis of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, for his assistance in making contact with the participating seminaries.

To Mr. James Cross of the Department of Missions, Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, for aid in noting new types of ministry.

To students and faculty of all seminaries involved in the project.

Finally, to my wife, Ruth, for editing, typing and inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Statement of Approach	2
B. Importance of the Problem	3
C. Objectives	3
D. Statement of the Problem	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
A. Reference Groups and Classical Theory	6
B. Reference Groups and Contemporary Theory	7
C. Recent Literature	8
D. Médical Students.	12
E. Ministerial Specialization	14
F. Associated Factors.	16
III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	19
A. Basic Theoretical Model	19
B. Research Hypotheses	20
IV. METHODOLOGY.	22
A. Development of the Questionnaire.	22
B. Pretesting the Questionnaire.	23
C. Population.	23
D. Administration of the Questionnaire	24
E. Analysis Procedure.	25
F. Description of Participating Seminaries	28

Chapter	Page
V. ANALYSIS OF DATA	30
A. Introduction.	30
B. Influences and Aspirations.	30
C. Influences and Expectations	37
D. Socioeconomic Factors and Aspirations	41
E. Socioeconomic Factors and Expectations.	51
F. Socioeconomic Factors and Influences.	61
G. Relations Among Socioeconomic Factors	68
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	72
A. General Summary	72
B. Variables not Found Significant	78
C. Conclusions	78
D. Contributions	83
E. Limitations of the Study.	84
F. Recommendations	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	88
APPENDIX A.	96
APPENDIX B.	109
APPENDIX C.	174
APPENDIX D.	185

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1. Conceptual Model	19
4.1. Distribution of Respondents According to Seminary by Number and Percent.	24
4.2. Distribution of Respondents According to Class in Seminary by Number and Percent	25
4.3. Class and Percentage Distribution of Respondents by Seminary .	26
5.1. Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence.	31
5.2. Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence.	32
5.3. Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence.	33
5.4. Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence.	34
5.5. Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence	35
5.6. Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence	36
5.7. Ministry Expected When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence.	38
5.8. Ministry Expected When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence.	38a
5.9. Ministry Expected Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence	39
5.10. Ministry Expected Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence	40
5.11. Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position	42
5.12. Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry	43

Table	Page
5.13. Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Political Preference	44
5.14. Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Class in Seminary	46
5.15. Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position.	47
5.16. Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry.	48
5.17. Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Undergraduate Major	49
5.18. Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Political Preference.	50
5.19. Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position	52
5.20. Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry	53
5.21. Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Political Preference	54
5.22. Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Birth Order	55
5.23. Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Sureness of ministry.	56
5.24. Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Undergraduate Major	58
5.25. Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Political Preference.	60
5.26. Class in Seminary, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence	61
5.27. Birth Order, According to Influence of a Brother on Decision to Enter Seminary.	62
5.28. Size of Place, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence.	63

Table	Page
5.29. Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence, According to Doctrinal Position	64
5.30. Extent of Education, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence.	65
5.31. Age of Decision, to Study for the Ministry According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence.	66
5.32. Sureness of Ministry, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence	67
5.33. Marital State, According to Class in Seminary.	68
5.34. Doctrinal Position, According to Class in Seminary	69
5.35. Participation in Church Activities While in College, According to Age of Decision to Study for the Ministry	70
5.36. Participation in Church Activities While in College, According to Sureness of Ministry.	71
6.1. Associations Found to be Significant	80

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, especially since 1967, a great number of different kinds of ministries have emerged. New kinds of specialties seemed linked primarily with cities: coffeehouse, hippie, industrial, night people, shopping center, halfway house, and race track. Differentiation of the general parish ministry into many specializations lagged behind, yet was another aspect of the general trend toward occupational specialization.¹

The greatest demand for seminary graduates was for the general, traditional, undifferentiated ministry. A cycle seemed to operate during the education and professional training of the seminary student. There was often considerable feeling on the part of the student that he would find his desired specialization upon graduation. However, this outlook was somewhat vague, cloudy and idealistic. Considerable disillusionment about such a possibility appeared to occur as the student gained actual experience in the parish situation and in his intern year. In his senior year, the seminarian moved more and more to the conclusion that almost all available positions were in the general parish ministry. Alternatives upon graduation tended to be either graduate school or the general parish ministry. Specialization for seminarians, then, tended to come in several ways, but subsequent to

¹Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960); cf. Richard Luecke, "Why Take an Honest Job if You Can Be a Minister?," Religion and Life, Vol. 35 (1966), pp. 353-363.

graduation. Men remaining within the parish ministry moved into some special area of the general ministry. Such areas included traditional ministerial specializations as well as the recent new categories mentioned earlier. Specialization also took the form of movement out of the general parish ministry. Such types of specializations included teaching religion at the college or seminary level, teaching other subjects at the college level, church administration, and social work.² These contemporary phenomena among clergy deserve investigation and raise important questions.

Statement of Approach

This study developed partially from a long-term interest in occupational choice. Interest was focused upon the present topic as a result of reading Phillips'³ study of medical student specialization. Phillips report aroused curiosity concerning occupational choice and specialization among seminary students. Interest was intensified further by reading of literature dealing with the roles of the clergymen,

²Luecke, loc. cit.; Ross P. Scherer, "Ministers of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod: Origins, Training, Careers, Lives, Place, Plans of Work and Reference," personal interviews with James Cross, Department of Missions, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (June 7-8, 1969); personal interview with Douglas Lewis, Director of Research, Church Federation of Greater Chicago, and his assistant, Vern Viscik (June 24, 1969); personal interview with Franklin Sherman, Department of Social Ethics, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, (June 27, 1969); Ross P. Scherer, "Some Statistics on Church Personnel," in Ross P. Scherer and Theodore O. Wedel eds., The Church and Its ManPower Management (New York: Department of Ministry of Vocation and Pastoral Services, National Council of Churches, 1966), pp. 45-47, cf. Edwin Lewis Becker, "Religious Field Work as Experience in the Social Roles of the Minister" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1956).

³Bernard S. Phillips, Social Research: Strategy and Tactics (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968), pp. 4-17.

including material by Hadden, Scherer, and Bridston and Culver.⁴

Importance of the Problem

The problem was important in that it dealt with the influences and goals of those entering an occupation beset by great turmoil. Recently, clergy have undergone increasing role specialization. At the same time, church offerings have been declining, resulting in reduced numbers of positions available to graduating students. Further, there has been increased emphasis on relevance and social concern among both clergy and seminarians. A recent interest in non-parish positions and new ministries has been evident, with many leaving the parish ministry or moving into non-salaried ministries.

Objectives

The basic purpose of the study was to explore the attitudes, outlook and background of those training for the ministry: specifically, the question was one of determining whether the "generation gap" between seminarians and ministers actually existed.

The following objectives directed the research:

1. Investigation of the nature and extent of influence of persons perceived as significant by seminarians in relation to their occupational choice.

⁴Keith Bridston and Dwight W. Culver, Pre-Seminary Education: Report of the Lilly Endowment Study (Minneapolis Augsburg Publishing House, 1965); cf. Jeffrey Hadden, The Gathering Storm in the Churches (Garden City: Doubleday, 1969); and Ross P. Scherer, "Ministers of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod: Origins, Training, Careers, Lives, Place, Plans of Work and Reference" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963).

2. Investigation of the nature and extent of influence of motivations perceived as significant by seminarians in relation to their occupational choice.

3. Investigation of the occupational aspirations and expectations of seminarians.

4. Investigation of the nature of the socioeconomic background of seminarians.

5. Investigation of the nature and extent of the relation between the perceived influence of reference persons and seminarians' occupational choice.

6. Investigation of the nature and extent of the relation between the perceived influence of reference motivations, and seminarians' occupational choice.

7. Investigation of the extent of the relation between socioeconomic factors and occupational specialization.

8. Investigation of the nature and extent of influence of persons perceived as significant by seminarians in relation to socioeconomic factors.

9. Investigation of the nature and extent of motivations perceived as significant by seminarians in relation to socioeconomic factors.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to examine factors influencing occupational specialization choices of seminary students and sources of motivations to enter these specialties. This problem suggests three subordinate questions:

1. Is there a relationship between perceived influence of reference persons and occupational specialization?

2. Is there a relationship between perceived influence of reference motivations, and occupational specialization?

3. Is there a relationship between socioeconomic factors and occupational specialization?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Reference Groups and Classical Theory

Crucial to reference group theory was its emphasis of social psychology. Thomas'¹ phrase, "definition of the situation," with its emphasis that the way an individual looks at reality was as basic as that reality itself was stressed in the concept of reference group. Cooley,² Mead,³ and Piaget⁴ in their development of socialization theory assumed and stressed the role of reference groups concerning personality. The primary group, which for Cooley involved the family, peer groups, and the neighborhood, was thought to act as reference groups for the individual. Mead's⁵ emphasis on the generalized other that evolves in an individual's mind and personality was part of the reference group setting.

Reference individuals were related by Merton to reference group

¹E. H. Volkart ed, Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research (Social Science Research Council, 1951), pp. 121-144.

²Charles H. Cooley, Human Nature and the Social Order (New York: Scribner, 1902).

³George Herbert Mead, Mind, Self, and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), pp. 144-145, 149-164, 253-257.

⁴Jean Piaget, The Moral Judgment of the Child (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1948), pp. 404-411.

⁵Mead, loc. cit.

theory. Merton⁶ gave particular attention to Mead's "significant other" concept. This idea emphasized early socialization of the child, with the mother tending to be the significant other or reference individual for him. This concept had implications for later socialization as well, particularly with regard to influences affecting occupational choice.

Thomas, Mead, Cooley and Piaget are thus foundations of reference group theory. Their views can be applied to occupational specialization as well as occupational choice. The individual defines a certain specialization in his area of work as the one he desires. The group of people that specialize in it may be his reference group or "generalized other," and the individual is influenced by other people perceived as significant to him. These reference individuals (significant others) influence him to move toward specializing in a given area of his chosen field.

Reference Groups and Contemporary Theory

Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance also has relevance for reference group theory. He assumed that individuals in their work attempted to reduce conflict from loyalties to different groups, individuals, and values by relating to occupational specializations which harmonized and balanced these conflicting claims.⁷

⁶Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (New York: The Free Press, 1968), pp. 383-385, 388-389, 439.

⁷Leon Festinger, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968).

George Homans applied reference group theory to occupational specialization. He linked together the larger systems operating on an individual with the smaller ones which were his immediate context. The area of occupational specialization was seen as his internal system. This system acted as the person's reference group, depending on the number of groups the person had and the extent of his attachment to them. Individuals within or outside one's specialization were held to operate as reference individuals to a varying degree.⁸

Recent Literature

Turner restricted the use of "reference group," limiting this term to the source of the person's major perspectives and values, entitled the "identification group." At the opposite extreme were those groups that affect and condition individual action in a minor way. He called these "interaction groups." Turner saw "reference group" as a generalized other having members and attribute roles independent of the individual.⁹

Litwak distinguished between past, present and future reference groups. He stated that integration into one group enabled a person to relate to another group, and that membership or orientation toward a given occupational group was the setting for his integration into an occupational specialization group.¹⁰

⁸ George C. Homans, The Human Group (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1950).

⁹ Ralph H. Turner, "Role-Taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference-Group Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 61, No. 4 (January, 1956), pp. 316-328.

¹⁰ Eugene Litwak, "Reference Group Theory, Bureaucratic Career, and Neighborhood Primary Group Cohesion," Sociometry, Vol. 23, No. 1 (March, 1960, pp. 72-83.

Kemper in his recent article related reference groups to achievement. The normative reference group guided the individual by emphasizing specific norms and values. Comparison groups assisted the individual to see if he was being treated equally. They included role models--individuals the actor imitates in order to gain skills which he lacks. Accommodator groups were comparison groups which show in what way behavior should be adjusted to harmonize with the situation. Audience groups, Kemper's third type, were those that the individual perceives as being affected by his behavior.

Kemper's reference groups types are significant for understanding the occupational specialization process. Normative groups emphasize behavior considered appropriate to the specialization. Comparative groups provide models for imitation, bases for accommodation to the behavior of specialists, and assist one in being happy with the specialization.¹¹

Newcomb et. al. introduced the concept of positive and negative reference groups. A positive reference group was one in which a person was motivated to be accepted and treated as a member, either overtly or symbolically. Negative reference groups motivated the person to oppose or react against. A group was able simultaneously to be for the same person both a positive and negative reference group, permitting his conformity to some of its norms, but not others.¹²

¹¹Theodore D. Kemper, "Reference Groups, Socialization, and Achievement," American Sociological Review, Vol. 33, No. 1 (February, 1968), pp. 31-45.

¹²T. M. Newcomb et. al., Social Psychology (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 109.

Newcomb's contribution was to the study of occupational specialization. He wrote that one's commitment to a given specialization could be re-enforced by positive reference groups or individuals. These referents were those influential on an individual and positively oriented toward a given specialization. Negative reference persons tended to pull a person away from his commitment or tendency to specialize in an area of work he might otherwise select. Similarly, subgroups and cliques within an individual's life operated as negative or positive reference groups. As such, they affected both his choice of occupation and his specialization within that occupation.

Newcomb et. al. saw reference groups, individuals and values as all included in a person's attitude system. Other persons and groups were seen as "focal objects." A crucial aspect of reference groups for the individual was that he possessed both psychological as well as actual membership; that is, reference groups were those to which a person is oriented apart from actual membership.

Manford Kuhn attempted to clarify the concept of reference group. He defined the term as a social group with which he aimed to further identify. From these reference groups came his norms, attitudes and values. From such groups were derived meaningful social categories--both those he is assigned to and those with which he is contrasted. Kuhn noted the distinction made by some between the normative and comparative functions of reference groups. He felt there had been a failure to make the proper distinction between group and category. Only reference groups could be the source of attitudes and norms and create meaningful classifications of social objects and individuals. In his clarification,

Kuhn rejected Newcomb's et. al. rationale of positive and negative reference groups. He, with the Sherifs, rejected labeling every group with which an individual had an attitude or relationship reference group.¹³

Harry Johnson listed four ways in which a group functioned as a reference group: (1) when an individual aspired to membership in a group; (2) when an individual strove to be like members of the reference group in one respect or tried to make one of his membership groups like the reference group; (3) when a person received satisfaction from being different from members of the reference group in some way and strove to maintain this difference; and (4) when an individual evaluated himself and his membership group using the reference group as a standard, even though he might not strive to be either like or unlike members of the reference group.¹⁴

The Sherifs saw reference groups as those toward which an individual was oriented, whether or not he was a member. The individual was nominally a member of many groups; however, not all of these were equally influential on his behavior. Individual standards and aspirations were regulated by reference groups. Therefore, a person was actually a member of one or more groups, yet psychologically related to others. The concept "anchorage" was essential for grasping effects of relating oneself to a social group. "Anchorage" was an influence

¹³Manford H. Kuhn, "The Reference Group," in Julius Gould and William L. Kolb eds., *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences* (New York: The Free Press, 1964), pp. 580-581.

¹⁴Harry M. Johnson, *Sociology: A Systematic Introduction* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1960), pp. 39-40.

limiting and affecting a person's outlook. Alteration of the major group anchorage or tie (i.e. change of reference groups) affected many other attitudes and relations. People seemed to require and need anchorage. More than one influence usually serves as key reference points (anchorages) in one's structuring of experience. Occasionally a person found anchorage in conflict.¹⁵

Medical Students

Many studies have emerged dealing with the effect of reference group influences on medical students. Prominent was Merton et. al., The Student-Physician. This empirical work, using a structured questionnaire, noted several ways in which influence operated. Merton pointed out the critical role of the father in influencing early decisions by sons to enter the medical profession, whereas those deciding later appeared influenced by friends already in medical school. Strong parental opposition tended to prevent those interested in medicine from ever reaching medical school and those who did not decide to enter medical school until they were in college experienced loosening of ties with their families with simultaneous increased influence from friends similar in age.

Merton also noted a relation between student evaluation and the expectations of students. The low-ranking students tended to lower their expectations, anticipating assignments more realistically. High-ranking students were encouraged by the faculty to apply for specialized

¹⁵Carolyn W. and Muzafer Sherif, An Outline of Social Psychology (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), pp. 83, 109, 175, 177, and 626.

internships. The selectivity process seemed to operate especially between the end of the third and the middle of the fourth years. There was clear indication that the faculty influenced decisions to specialize before the students actually submitted their internship applications. Medical students tended to fulfill the expectations of those with whom they interacted. There was a perceivable shift in self-image of medical student to one of physician.¹⁶

Back, Coker and Donnelly dealt with secondary choice in occupational selection. They noted that occupational training is a general matter rather than training for a definite job. Specialization offered a person a series of alternatives within his chosen field. Secondary choice offered a person the chance to get greater job satisfaction while simultaneously retaining the general status of the occupation even though different specializations within an occupation varied in status. Medical schools socialized the future doctor in the values of the profession. He learned what doctors do, the standards for evaluating different careers, and patterns for dealing with patients. Informal interaction among the students and association with faculty steered the medical student toward a given specialization. Other such influences were physicians connected with and practicing at the hospital. Secondary choice may have acted to bridge the gap between preferred types of activity within the profession and the basic idea or model of expected

¹⁶Robert K. Merton, George G. Reader, and Patricia L. Kendall eds., The Student-Physician: Introductory Studies in the Sociology of Medical Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957, pp. 115-116, 118-120, 122-123, 125, 127, 155-156, 169, 171, 173-174, 181, 205.

behavior for the profession.¹⁷

Back et. al. noted the influence of medical school faculty on values and specialization of medical students. Faculty who taught full-time and had heavy teaching loads were more likely to be seen as influential, though faculty influence varied with department. Faculty influences seemed greater in specializations less known by the student prior to medical school. The influence of family, friends, and fellow-students was greater for widely-known, high-prestige areas of specialization.¹⁸

Ministerial Specialization

Scherer noted a trend toward specialization among Missouri Synod clergy. New specializations included military, institutional and campus chaplaincies. Older specializations were the teaching of religion at colleges and seminaries, church administration, and social welfare. However, the concept of ministerial task among professional churchmen still focused on the general parish ministry.¹⁹ In recent years, literature has shown increased specialization even in the parish ministry, particularly in urban areas. Such specialization included such experimental ministries as coffee house, jazz, apartment house, and

¹⁷ Kurt W. Back, Robert E. Coker, and Thomas G. Donnelly, "Public Health as a Career of Medicine: Secondary Choice within a Profession" American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, No. 5 (October, 1958) pp. 533-541.

¹⁸ Back, et. al., op. cit., p. 533 ff.

¹⁹ Ross P. Scherer, "Ministers of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod: Origins, Training, Careers, Lives, Place, Plans of Work and Reference" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963), pp. 4, 10-11.

youth. Younger clergy seemed oriented more toward specialization outside the parish.

In Religious Identity, Gibson Winter reviewed the social setting of specialization in church occupations. He noted that from 1890 to 1960 there was a major transformation and growth of U.S. religious groups. Accompanying this growth was an increasing complexity of and differentiation in occupations. As a result, there was a radical change in the internal life of the community. Organizational growth in Protestantism was accompanied by elaboration of administrative staff as well as centralization through agencies and boards. The same trend, evident in Judaism and Roman Catholicism, was an effect of the American ethic. Secularization, resulting in an increasing differentiation of both the religious and secular on the formal level, resulted at the same time in a deeper penetration of religious values into life on an informal level. Winter saw the development of new forms of ministry as the means whereby all three major American religious groups coped with an increasingly complex society.²⁰

Luckmann saw ministerial specialization related to the strong societal valuation of individual religiosity and unbridled privacy resulting in the explosion and proliferation of types of ministries outside the congregation. There has also been a significant modification of the traditional ministries within the congregation. Luckmann

²⁰ Gibson Winter, Religious Identity: A Study of Religious Organization New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968, pp. 1-3, 19, 30 97-98, 111.

thus emphasized the interrelation of culture and ministerial specialization.²¹

Becker noted that pre-seminary groups (family, school, church and peers), and seminary community and field work groups affected seminary students similarly to those medical groups mentioned by Merton et. al.²²

Associated Factors

Osborn suggested the motives influencing people to enter seminary training: (1) serving God; (2) vocational or inner fulfillment; and (3) status. This last occurred to a lesser extent.²³

Lindenthal investigated the age factor and tried to discover whether and how men entering seminary and the ministry in later life differed from the younger entrant. He found that older seminarians were more marginal socially, significantly more mobile, and less salaried when they entered seminary. Compared with the younger men, the older seminarians entered the ministry for different reasons, displayed more interest in practical and pastoral theology, and scored significantly higher on religious and social dimensions. Lindenthal suggested that there may be different types of influences caused by variant value patterns for the older and younger groups operating not only upon the timing of their decision to enter seminary, but also

²¹Thomas Luckmann, The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1967), pp. 84-86, 95-96.

²²Ronald E. Osborn, "Motivation for Ministerial Enlistment," Encounter, Vol. 23 (1962), pp. 62-77.

²³Becker, loc. cit.

affecting later specialization, within or outside the general parish ministry. Such a distinctiveness has been found to operate in Episcopal seminaries.²⁴

Faculty influence appeared to operate at some seminaries. Viscik²⁵ suggested that the typical seminary professor, supposedly a parish ministry role model for the student, actually diverted the seminarian from parish orientation by exemplifying the scholarly intellectual. He often had minimal interest and connection with the parish ministry.²⁶

Scherer's study gave reason to believe that a considerable number of other variables operated as influences affecting choice of ministry as a career and seminary training as a means to that career: size of place, class background of parents, and father's occupation.²⁷

In a recent study Hadden showed how laity pressured Protestant clergy into conformist patterns of behavior. Conflict between Protestant clergy and laity was found due to a crucial contrast between the two groups. While religiously liberal clergy were also politically liberal, there was no such relationship among the laity. Clergy, influenced by the new theology, have moved outside the church to show concern for the world. The laymen, in contrast, has sought comfort in the church and

²⁴Jacob Jay Lindenthal, "The Delayed Decision to Enter the Ministry: A Study in Occupational Change" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1967).

²⁵Interview with Douglas Lewis and Vern Viscik, loc. cit.

²⁶Robert K. Merton and Richard Christie, "Procedures for the Sociological Study of the Values Climate of Medical Schools," Journal of Medical Education, Vol. 33, No. 10, pt. 2 (October 1958), pp. 125-153.

²⁷Scherer, loc. cit.

escape from the world. Protestant seminary students expressed their negative reaction to lay pressure by becoming increasingly opposed to the parish ministry.²⁸

²⁸ Jeffrey K. Hadden, loc. cit.

CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Basic Theoretical Model

Merton¹ et. al. provided an appropriate theoretical mode. They related reference group theory specifically to the medical profession, and in general to all types of work. Since reference theory was applied particularly to medical students, it also has implication for seminary students. Merton's et. al. work was of considerable value for this study, since they related reference group theory to the occupational choice process of medical students, using empirical research. Because of this effort, reference group theory has not only a probable but an actual relationship to the occupational choice of seminary students. Table 3.1 clarifies the theoretical model used for this study as derived from Merton.

Table 3.1 --Conceptual Model

Element Trait	Element Process	System Trait	System Process
Specialization within the occupation	Reference group identification	Distribution of specializations	Differential Motivation to specialization

¹Merton et. al., loc. cit.

The following propositions can therefore be stated:

- Proposition 1. Occupational choice and specialization are functions of motivation and identification.
- Proposition 2. Reference motivations, persons and groups are instruments for motivation and identification.
- Proposition 3. Reference motivations, persons and groups influence occupational choice and specialization.
- Proposition 4. Therefore, occupational expectations and aspirations of seminarians are related to perceived reference influences.

Research Hypotheses

From the review of literature and the conceptual framework, the following research hypotheses were derived:

1. Seminarians who perceive different influences as being instrumental, will not differ significantly in their occupational specialization aspirations.
2. Seminarians who perceive different influences as being instrumental will not differ significantly in their occupational specialization expectations.
3. Seminarians with different socio-economic characteristics will not differ significantly in their occupational specialization aspirations.
4. Seminarians with different socio-economic characteristics will not differ significantly in their occupational specialization expectations.

5. Seminarians with different socio-economic characteristics will not differ significantly in influences perceived as affecting their decision to enter seminary.
6. Selected socio-economic characteristics of seminarians will not differ significantly with class in seminary.
7. Selected socio-economic characteristics of seminarians will not differ significantly with extent of participation in church activities while in college.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Development of the Questionnaire

Several different questionnaires related to the topic were reviewed. The instrument used in Straus and Nelson's text¹ was the model for the questions dealing with ascribed characteristics and occupations. Elements were included taken from journal articles by Sewell et. al.² Questions dealing with medical students were selected from instruments by Merton et. al.³ and some used by Scherer⁴ were adapted to provide questions dealing with reference persons, motivations, and background. Haller and Miller's Occupational Aspiration Scale⁵ was used to develop questions dealing with the occupational aspirations and expectations of ministers. Further, panel interviews of knowledgeable persons were used to develop questions dealing with ministerial occupational specialization. Professional, religious and sociology journals, and selected popular literature were reviewed to determine

¹Murray A. Straus and Joel I. Nelson, Sociological Analysis: An Empirical Approach Through Replication (Harper and Row: New York, 1968).

²Sewell, loc. cit., of Sewell, Haller and Portes, loc. cit., and Sewell, Haller and Straus, loc. cit.; Sewell and Shah, "Social Class Parental Encouragement, and Educational Aspiration," loc. cit.; Sewell and Shah, "Socioeconomic Status, Intelligence, and the Attainment of Higher Education," loc. cit.

³Merton, The Student-Physician, loc. cit.

⁴Scherer, loc. cit.

⁵Archibald O. Haller and Irwin W. Miller, The Occupational Aspiration Scale (Second Printing, Department of Rural Sociology, Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1967), cf. Appendix C.

occupational specialization within the ministry resulting in a list of 96 ministerial specializations. Approximately 200 students taking Introductory Sociology in January 1970 were asked to rate these ministerial specializations following the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale methodology. Based on these ratings, a prestige score for each occupational specialization was determined following the model of Dean and Valdes.⁶ Four pairs of questions were constructed to measure idealistic and realistic occupational specialization goals using the procedure listed in Haller and Miller.⁷

Pretesting the Questionnaire

In February, 1970, copies of the instrument were distributed by members of the Sociology Department of Valparaiso University to the preseminary students in their classes; further, it was distributed in dormitories to those not contacted in the classroom. A total of 44 questionnaires out of 52 were returned by March 1, 1970. Evaluation of these returns led to the final form of the instrument. (see Appendix A).

Population

Four Chicago Area seminaries, three in the St. Louis area, and two in northern Indiana comprised the population for the study. These seminaries were presumed to reflect the diversity of denominations present in their areas and their student attitudes, values and goals of seminarians in the areas. (see Tables 4.1 and 4.2).

⁶Dwight G. Dean and Donald M. Valdes, Experiments in Sociology (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), pp. 214-215.

⁷Haller and Miller, op. cit., pp. 44-45; See Appendix C.

Administration of the Questionnaire

The questionnaires were administered in group settings and data collected in all seminaries during April, 1970. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 366 seminarians. Tables 4.1 to 4.3 show the distribution.

TABLE 4.1--Distribution of respondents according to seminary by number and percent

Seminary	Frequency	Percent
Grace	149	40.72
Eden	74	20.22
Catholic Union	32	8.74
Associated Mennonite	31	8.47
Northern Baptist	22	6.01
Concordia, St. Louis	17	4.64
Concordia, Springfield	15	4.10
Bellarmino	13	3.55
North Park	13	3.55
Total	366	100.00

TABLE 4.2---Distribution of respondents according to class in seminary by number and percent

Class	Frequency	Percent
First Year	141	38.74
Second Year	115	31.59
Third Year	60	16.48
Last Year	48	13.19
Total	364	100.00

Analysis Procedure

Data from the 366 schedules were coded for machine processing. All statistical calculations were based on actual frequencies and the chi-square test was chosen with significance set at the .05 level. The research hypotheses were stated in null form.

To test the relation between influence and types of ministry, extent of influence was compared. Total of items zero and one on the extent of influence scale were defined as "least influence." Totals of items five and six were defined as "most influence." Totals of items two, three and four were defined as "intermediate influence." (Appendix B)

To clarify the relation between degree of confidence in the ministry, one's life work and types of ministry, the categories of extent of confidence were reduced from five to three: "very sure" and "somewhat sure" were combined into "sure," "somewhat unsure" and "very unsure" into "unsure." This provided more adequate basis for comparison.

TABLE 4.3--Class and percentage distribution of respondents by seminary

Class	Seminary								
	Grace (N=149)	North Park (N=12)	Northern Baptist (N=22)	Catholic Union (N=32)	Eden (N=74)	Assoc. Mennonite (N=31)	Bellarmino (N=13)	Concordia Springfield (N=15)	Concordia St. Louis (N=17)
Percent									
First Year	48.98	16.67	38.10	12.50	48.65	35.49	23.08	13.33	29.41
Second Year	30.20	41.67	38.10	50.00	31.08	6.45	38.46	46.67	23.53
Third Year	20.81	8.33	14.28	28.12	5.41	29.03	23.08	0.00	0.00
Last Year	2.01	33.33	9.52	9.38	14.86	29.03	15.38	40.00	47.06
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

To examine the association between political preference and type of ministry more clearly, types of political preference were reduced from five to three; liberal and conservative sub-categories for Democrats and Republicans were combined into Democrat and Republican.

Undergraduate major categories were reduced to five. Majors such as agriculture, engineering and pharmacy were assigned together to the "applied science" category.

Birth order categories were reduced to four by introducing a fourth or more in birth order cells making the four categories more equal in frequencies.

Relationships tested were classed mainly according to two categories of occupational specializations: aspirational, dealing with specializations to which seminarians would like to have worked in immediately after they graduated and ten years after graduation; expectation, specializations seminarians actually felt they would fill after graduation as well as ten years later. Other relationships tested associations with socioeconomic factors.

The following definitions were considered necessary:

"Significant other:" a person perceived as a model for some aspect of behavior.

"Significant motivation:" influence perceived as affecting some aspect of a person's behavior.

"Perceived influence:" effect felt from motivations or individuals.

"Reference group:" a group or category whose standards, expectations and norms were actually followed by an individual.

"Reference person:" an individual whose standards, expectations and norms were followed by an individual in his actual behavior.

"Occupational specialization aspiration:" the job specialization the seminarian hoped he will obtain.

"Occupational specialization expectation:" the job specialization the seminarian expected to obtain.

"Socioeconomic factors:" background elements of an individual, such as age, race, size of family, place of origin, and political affiliation.

"Significant others:" those persons assumed to exert influence on the decision of seminarians to study for the ministry. In this study, significant others were defined as minister, wife, girl friend or fiancée, brother, father, mother, best friend, Sunday School or parochial school teacher, youth group leader, church councilman, deacon or trustee, and Boy Scout leader.

"Significant motivations:" those assumed to exert influence on the decision of seminarians to study for the ministry. In this study, significant motivations included a desire to help people, a concern for social and community problems, a feeling of duty or obligation, a feeling that God called you (divine call), and a feeling that there was really no alternative job or occupation.

Description of Participating Seminaries

Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana, was affiliated with the National Fellowship of Brethren Churches:

Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Oak Brook, Illinois, was an agency of the American Baptist Convention; and North Park Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois, was operated by the Evangelical Covenant Church of America; Catholic Theological Union, Chicago

Illinois, prepared men for the Roman Catholic priesthood; Eden Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, served the United Church of Christ; Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminaries, Elkhart, Indiana, trained clergy of the General Conference of the Mennonite Church; Bellarmine School of Theology, Chicago, Illinois, prepared men for the Chicago and Detroit provinces of the Jesuit Order of the Roman Catholic Church; and Concordia Theological Seminaries, St. Louis, Missouri and Springfield, Illinois, educated clergy for the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the material presented in the accompanying tables. Of the 318 associations investigated, 64 were found to be significant at the .05 level.

Influences and Aspirations

1. Null Hypothesis: Seminarians who perceive different influences as being instrumental will not differ significantly in their occupational specialization aspirations.

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to questions dealing with perceived influence and those dealing with occupational aspirations (type of ministry desired) when seminarians graduated.

Significant association was found between type of ministry desired when training was completed, and influence perceived from a minister (.01 level). Significant association was found between type of ministry desired when training was completed, and influence perceived from a divine call (.05 level). The rank order and frequency for types of ministry were nearly identical for perceived influence of both minister and a divine call. Associate pastor of a town and country church was by far the strongest specialization. The several chaplain categories were lowest in count (see Table 5.1).

TABLE 5.1.--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence

Type of Ministry	Perceived Influence	
	Minister (N=346)	Divine Call (N=346)
	PERCENT	
Associate Pastor, Town and Country	34.10	33.81
Foreign Missionary	18.79	19.36
Director of Counseling	16.47	19.08
Director of Religious Education	10.98	10.98
Pastor of a Coffee House	10.69	10.40
Prison Chaplain	4.34	4.34
Veterans' Chaplain	4.05	1.45
Chaplain, Retirement Center	0.58	0.58
Total	100.00	100.00

There was a much stronger feeling of most influence of a divine call. Highest in frequency for most influence for both minister and divine call were town and country associate pastor and foreign missionary. The various types of chaplaincies registered very low frequencies (see Table 5.2).

TABLE 5.2.--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence*

Type of Ministry	Most Influence		Least Influence	
	Divine Call (N=231)	Minister (N=129)	Divine Call (N=39)	Minister (N=70)
PERCENT				
Associate Pastor, Town and Country	37.19	35.65	23.08	31.42
Foreign Missionary	22.94	21.71	7.69	18.57
Director of Counseling	15.15	13.18	35.90	10.00
Director of Religious Education	9.96	9.30	12.82	12.86
Pastor of a Coffee House	8.66	11.63	12.82	11.43
Prison Chaplain	3.51	6.98	7.69	2.86
Veterans' Chaplain	2.16	1.55	0.00	12.86
Chaplain, Retirement Center	0.43	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 1 and 2 for the full range of influence.

Significant associations were found between type of ministry desired when training was completed, and influence perceived from a divine call, wife or girl friend, and youth leader (.01 level). Rank order for all types of influence was identical. There was little variation in frequency for the various ministerial ways. Highest in frequency was assistant pastor of a downtown church. Significant

responses were evident for counseling center and inner city pastors.

Executive types were scarcely represented (see Table 5.3).

TABLE 5.3.--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence

Type of Ministry	Perceived Influence		
	Wife or Girl Friend (N=338)	Youth Leader (N=340)	Divine Call (N=342)
	PERCENT.		
Assistant Pastor, Downtown Church	32.54	30.89	33.05
Pastor of a Counseling Center	24.85	22.65	24.56
Pastor of an Inner City Church	23.96	21.47	23.68
Pastor to an Ethnic Group	7.40	9.41	7.31
Radio Pastor	6.51	8.82	6.73
Executive, American Missions Board	2.37	3.82	2.34
Executive, Board of Stewardship	1.78	2.06	1.75
Chaplain, School for the Deaf	0.59	0.88	0.58
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

Most influence responses for feeling of divine call were radically stronger than for felt influence of wife or girl friend and youth leader. Downtown church assistant pastor was the ministerial type receiving the most responses. Executive ministries received the fewest most influence responses (see Table 5.4).

TABLE 5.4.--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence*

Type of Ministry	Most Influence			Least Influence		
	Divine Call (N=230)	Wife or Girl Friend (N=35)	Youth Leader (N=15)	Divine Call (N=37)	Wife or Girl Friend (N=200)	Youth Leader (N=249)
PERCENT						
Assistant Pastor, Downtown Church	35.22	48.56	26.67	18.92	30.50	33.33
Pastor, Inner City Church	27.83	20.00	40.00	13.51	22.50	22.89
Pastor, Counseling Center	18.70	14.29	13.33	43.24	27.00	24.10
Radio Pastor	8.26	2.86	13.33	2.70	8.50	6.43
Pastor to an Ethnic Group	7.39	11.43	0.00	5.41	7.00	8.43
Exec., Board Amer. Missions	1.30	2.86	6.67	8.11	2.00	2.41
Exec., Board of Stewardship	1.30	0.00	0.00	5.41	2.00	2.41
Chaplain, School for the Deaf	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.70	0.50	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 3-5 for the full range of extent of influence.

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to the association between questions dealing with perceived influence, and those dealing with occupational specialization aspirations of seminarians ten years after they completed their training.

TABLE 5.5.--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed,
According to Perceived Influence

Type of Ministry	Perceived Influence Councilman (N=338)	Divine Call (N=340)	Duty (N=340)
	PERCENT		
Pastor, Suburban Church	40.54	40.28	39.99
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	13.31	13.24	13.53
Executive, Board of Theological Education	13.31	13.24	13.24
Evangelist	9.17	9.71	9.71
Armed Services Chaplain	6.51	6.47	6.47
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	6.51	6.47	6.47
Denomination President	6.21	6.18	6.18
Shopping Center Pastor	4.44	4.41	4.41
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

Significant association was found between type of ministry desired ten years after training was completed, and influence perceived from a church councilman, a divine call (both at the .01 level), and from a feeling of duty (.05 level). Ranking of ministries desired ten years after training was completed were nearly identical, regardless of the type of perceived influence. Suburban church pastor received around 40% of the tallies for each type. Denomination president and shopping center pastor were generally lowest in frequency (see Table 5.5).

Most influence was twice as strong for divine call as for duty. Both categories far outshone influence of councilman. The reverse was true for least influence. Suburban church pastor was highest for both categories, and shopping center pastor was lowest (see Table 5.6).

TABLE 5.6--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence *

Type of Ministry	Most Influence			Least Influence		
	Divine Call (N=227)	Duty (N=92)	Councilman (N=8)	Divine Call (N=36)	Duty (N=100)	Councilman (N=273)
	PERCENT					
Pastor, Suburban Church	45.38	40.22	62.50	27.78	31.00	39.94
Evangelist	11.89	18.48	0.00	5.56	10.00	8.06
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	11.01	5.43	0.00	13.89	16.00	13.55
Executive, Board Theological Educ.	10.57	13.04	0.00	30.55	16.00	13.55
Chaplain, Armed Services	8.37	9.78	25.00	2.78	6.00	5.86
Denomination President	5.29	4.35	0.00	8.33	6.00	6.59
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	5.29	7.61	12.50	8.33	8.00	6.96
Shopping Center Pastor	2.20	1.09	0.00	2.78	7.00	5.49
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 6-8 for the full range of extent of influence.

Influences and Expectations

2. Null Hypothesis: Seminarians who perceive different influences as being instrumental will not differ significantly in their occupational specialization expectations.

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to the association between questions dealing with perceived influence and those dealing with occupational specialization expectations (type of ministry expected) when seminarians graduated.

Significant association was found between type of ministry expected when training was completed, and influence perceived from a religion teacher, concern for community problems (both at .05 level), and from a divine call (.01 level). The rank order of frequencies for ministerial types was identical for perceived influence of religion teacher and concern for community problems. The type of ministry by far the highest in frequency was pastor of a town and country church. Lowest for all types of influence were executives of social ministry board and deaconness school (see Table 5.7).

The feeling of most influence of divine call was over twice as strong as that of concern for community problems. These two far overshadowed the most influence tallies for religion teacher. Town and country pastor was very strong for both most and least influence tallies. Executive categories were weak, perhaps due to lack of knowledge, or failure to conceive of them as ministries (see Table 5.8).

TABLE 5.7.--Ministry Expected When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence

Type of Ministry	Religion Teacher (N=340)	Divine Call (N=342)	Community Problems (N=343)
PERCENT			
Pastor, Town and Country	57.64	57.60	57.44
Director, Youth Work	13.24	13.16	13.12
Assistant Pastor, Town and Country	12.65	12.57	12.54
Worker Priest	6.18	5.85	6.12
Director, Community Organization	5.59	5.85	5.83
Seminary Professor	3.53	3.80	3.79
Executive, Board of Social Ministry	0.88	0.88	0.87
Administrator, Deaconness School	0.29	0.29	0.29
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to the association between questions dealing with perceived influence, and those dealing with occupational specialization expectations of seminarians ten years after they graduated.

Significant association was found between type of ministry expected ten years after training was completed, and influence perceived from a feeling of duty (.05 level), from a church councilman, and a brother (both at the .01 level). Ministerial types ranked identically

TABLE 5.8.--Ministry Expected When Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence*

Type of Ministry	Most Influence			Least Influence		
	Divine Call (N=231)	Community Problems (N=102)	Religion Teacher (N=24)	Divine Call (N=36)	Community Problems (N=83)	Religion Teacher (N=220)
PERCENT						
Pastor, Town and Country	65.37	42.16	45.82	30.55	72.31	61.38
Director, Youth Work	12.12	17.65	16.67	13.89	10.84	11.36
Assistant Pastor, Town and Country	10.82	13.73	16.67	25.00	8.43	10.91
Worker Priest	3.90	10.78	4.17	5.56	0.00	6.36
Director, Community Organization	3.46	9.80	12.50	13.89	1.20	6.36
Seminary Professor	3.03	3.92	4.17	11.11	6.02	3.18
Executive, Board Social Ministry	0.87	1.96	0.00	0.00	1.20	0.45
Administrator, Deaconess School	0.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 9-11 for the full range of extent of influence.

for influences of duty, councilman, or brother. The frequency listed for brother was less than for the other influences. Some respondents did not have brothers, and others did not respond to the question. Associate pastor, urban church and university director of religious affairs ranked highest for all categories of influence. Ministries to seamen ranked lowest (see Table 5.9).

TABLE 5.9.--Ministry Expected Ten Years After Training Completed,
According to Perceived Influence

Type of Ministry	Perceived Influence		
	Duty (N=335)	Councilman (N=335)	Brother (N=233)
	PERCENT		
Associate Pastor, Urban Church	39.10	35.51	39.91
Director, Religious Affairs, University	25.37	24.78	25.75
Executive, Board Youth Ministry	19.40	17.61	17.60
Pastor to Night People	8.96	12.84	8.58
Chaplain, Retarded Children's Home	2.99	4.48	3.86
Pastor to a Leper Colony	2.39	2.09	2.58
Pastor to Seamen	1.79	2.39	1.72
Chaplain of a Seamen's Home	0.00	0.30	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

The category of most influence was strongest for feeling of duty. Councilman influence was very high for least influence. Urban church associate pastor was highest in frequency within the most influence category. Ministries to specialized occupations and illnesses got few responses (see Table 5.10).

TABLE 5.10.--Ministry Expected Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence*

Type of Ministry	Most Influence			Least Influence		
	Duty (N=90)	Brother (N=10)	Councilman (N=8)	Duty (N=95)	Brother (N=189)	Councilman (N=269)
	PERCENT					
Associate Pastor, Urban Church	44.44	20.00	62.50	35.79	43.38	36.44
Director, Religious Affairs	25.56	20.00	25.00	27.37	21.69	25.69
Executive, Board Youth Ministry	16.67	20.00	0.00	13.68	18.52	14.50
Pastor to Night People	6.67	20.00	0.00	12.63	7.41	13.38
Pastor to a Leper Colony	3.33	10.00	0.00	3.16	2.65	2.23
Chaplain, Retarded Children	2.22	10.00	0.00	5.26	4.23	4.83
Pastor to Seamen	1.11	0.00	12.50	2.11	2.12	2.60
Chaplain of a Seamen's Home	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.37
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 12-14 for the full range of extent of influence.

Socioeconomic Factors and Aspirations

3. Null Hypothesis: Seminarians with different socioeconomic characteristics will not differ significantly in their occupational specialization aspirations.

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to the association between questions dealing with socioeconomic factors, and those dealing with occupational specialization aspirations when seminarians graduated.

Significant association was found between type of ministry desired when training was completed, and doctrinal position (.01 level). Highest in rank for conservatives and moderates were town and country associate pastor, downtown church assistant pastor, and foreign missionary. Counseling ministries were highest for liberals and high for moderates. Executive categories and ministries to special groups were uniformly low (see Table 5.11).

Significant association was found between seminarians' feeling sure that the ministry would be their life work, and type of ministry desired when training was completed (.01 level). Town and country associate pastor and downtown church assistant pastor were highest for those sure the ministry would be their life work. Executive types and chaplain of a school for the deaf were lowest (see Table 5.21).

There was significant association (.01 level) between political preference and ministry desired when training was completed (see Table 5.13). Conservatives had about the same number of responses as liberals. Town and country associate pastor was highest for all categories. Foreign missionary, a traditionally high-status ministry, was high in

TABLES 5.11.--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position *

Type of Ministry	Doctrinal Position		
	Conservative (N=316)	Moderate (N=176)	Liberal (N=166)
PERCENT			
Assoc. Pastor, Town & Country	20.88	18.74	10.84
Ass't. Pastor, Downtown Church	17.72	17.05	15.66
Foreign Missionary	16.14	2.84	6.63
Inner City Pastor	10.44	6.82	7.83
Counseling Center Pastor	7.59	17.61	17.48
Director of Counseling	6.01	15.34	10.24
Radio Pastor	5.70	0.00	3.01
Director, Religious Education	5.38	5.68	6.02
Pastor to an Ethnic Group	5.75	3.98	1.81
Pastor to a Coffee House	1.58	3.41	13.86
Prison Chaplain	1.58	3.41	2.41
Veterans' Chaplain	1.27	0.57	0.00
Executive, Stewardship Board	0.32	0.57	2.41
Executive, Amer. Missions Board	0.32	2.84	1.20
Chaplain, Retirement Center	0.32	0.57	0.00
Chaplain, School for Deaf	0.00	0.57	0.60
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 15 and 16 for more detail.

TABLE 5.12.--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry*

Type of Ministry	Sureness of Ministry		
	Sure (N=542)	Undecided (N=78)	Unsure (N=63)
PERCENT			
Associate Pastor, Town & Country	18.81	12.82	9.52
Assistant Pastor, Downtown Church	17.16	16.67	12.70
Pastor, Inner City Church	12.73	8.97	6.35
Pastor, Counseling Center	12.18	10.26	14.29
Foreign Missionary	8.49	7.69	3.17
Director, Religious Education	5.54	6.41	3.17
Director of Counseling	4.24	14.10	17.47
Veterans' Chaplain	4.06	0.00	0.00
Pastor to an Ethnic Group	3.69	3.85	3.17
Pastor of a Coffee House	3.51	10.26	12.70
Chaplain, Retirement Center	2.95	0.00	1.59
Radio Pastor	2.95	6.41	3.17
Prison Chaplain	2.40	0.00	3.17
Executive, Board of Stewardship	0.74	0.00	1.59
Executive, Board of American Missions	0.55	1.28	6.35
Chaplain, School for the Deaf	0.00	1.28	1.59
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 17 and 18 for more detail.

TABLE 5.13.--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Political Preference *

Type of Ministry	Political Preference		
	Conservative (N=135)	Liberal (N=137)	Independent (N=46)
	PERCENT		
Associate Pastor, Town and Country	38.53	27.73	39.13
Foreign Missionary	31.11	10.22	13.04
Director of Counseling	11.85	26.28	19.57
Director of Religious Education	8.89	13.14	10.87
Pastor of a Coffee House	3.70	15.33	13.04
Prison Chaplain	2.96	5.84	4.35
Veterans' Chaplain	2.22	0.73	0.00
Chaplain, Retirement Center	0.74	0.73	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 19 for more detail.

frequency for conservatives. Director of counseling was second for liberals and independents. Chaplaincies scored uniformly low.

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to the association between questions dealing with socioeconomic factors, and those dealing with occupational specialization aspirations ten years after seminarians graduated.

Significant association was found between type of ministry desired ten years after training was completed, and class in seminary (.01 level). Pastor of a suburban church received the highest number of tallies for all classes except the second year. Though other traditionally high-status ministries got considerable response, there was no really strong category of specialization. Students tended to emphasize traditional ministries. This might be explained by lack of knowledge of the newer ministries. Administrative ministries received few responses; the new, non-parish specializations scarcely any (see Table 5.14).

Significant association was found between type of ministry desired ten years after graduation, and doctrinal position (.01 level). Suburban church pastor was highest for conservatives and moderates. Liberals responded highest to college chaplain. Administrative, traditional and new ministries had low frequencies (see Table 5.15).

There was significant association (.01 level) between sureness of ministry and ministry desired ten years after training was completed (see Table 5.16). Suburban church pastor had the highest frequency both for those sure and those unsure that the ministry would be their life work. The overwhelming majority of respondents were sure that the ministry would be their life work.

There was significant association (.01 level) between undergraduate major and ministry desired ten years after training was completed (see Table 5.17). Suburban pastor was uniformly highest, and shopping center pastor, lowest.

TABLE 5.14.--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed,
According to Class In Seminary*

Type of Ministry	Class in Seminary			
	1st Year (N=262)	2nd Year (N=179)	3rd Year (N=116)	4th Year (N=90)
	PERCENT			
Pastor, Suburban Church	20.96	6.15	20.70	16.68
College Chaplain	16.03	14.53	8.62	8.89
Seminary Instructor	13.36	20.10	15.52	10.00
Assoc. Pastor, Suburban Church	12.60	12.85	12.07	12.22
Exec., Theological Education Bd.	5.73	2.79	4.31	4.44
Ass't. Pastor Inner City Church	5.73	5.59	10.34	6.67
Evangelist	5.73	2.23	5.17	2.22
Denomination President	3.82	7.26	0.86	6.67
Armed Services Chaplain	3.44	1.12	2.59	0.00
Ass't. Pastor, Suburban Church	3.05	0.56	4.31	4.44
Pastor, Prisoners' Halfway House	2.29	3.35	1.72	4.44
Exec., Bd. of Church Vocations	1.91	1.12	2.59	2.22
Pastor, Narcotics' Halfway House	1.91	2.79	0.86	6.67
Shopping Center Pastor	1.53	12.29	1.72	7.78
Ass't. Pastor, Urban Church	1.15	6.15	7.76	3.33
Pastor to Jazz Artists	0.76	1.12	0.86	3.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 20 and 21 for more detail.

TABLE 5.15.--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed,
According to Doctrinal Position*

Type of Ministry	Doctrinal Position		
	Conservative (N=335)	Moderate (N=175)	Liberal (N=163)
PERCENT			
Suburban Church Pastor	24.78	19.42	11.66
Seminary Instructor	18.21	9.71	12.27
Associate Suburban Pastor	13.73	15.43	4.29
College Chaplain	9.25	10.86	19.64
Evangelist	7.76	4.00	0.61
Armed Service Chaplain	5.07	1.14	1.23
Exec., Bd. Theological Education	3.88	8.00	10.43
Ass't. Pastor, Inner City Church	3.58	6.86	12.27
Ass't. Pastor, Urban Church	2.99	5.14	4.29
Ass't. Pastor, Suburban Church	2.69	3.43	3.07
Prisoners' Halfway House Pastor	2.69	2.86	2.45
Denomination President	2.09	2.86	5.52
Addicts' Halfway House Pastor	1.49	3.43	2.45
Exec., Bd. Church Vocations	1.49	2.29	1.23
Pastor to Jazz Artists	0.30	0.57	3.68
Shopping Center Pastor	0.00	4.00	4.91
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 22 and 23 for more detail.

TABLE 5.16.--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed,
According to Sureness of Ministry*

Type of Ministry	Sureness of Ministry		
	Sure (N=270)	Undecided (N=36)	Unsure (N=32)
	PERCENT		
Pastor, Suburban Church	44.07	16.67	37.48
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	11.85	16.67	21.88
Executive, Theological Education Board	11.48	19.44	18.75
Evangelist	11.11	8.33	3.13
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	6.67	11.11	0.00
Chaplain, Armed Services	6.30	11.11	3.13
Denomination President	5.19	11.11	6.25
Shopping Center Pastor	3.33	5.56	9.38
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 24 for more detail.

TABLE 5.17.--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed,
According to Undergraduate Major*

Type of Ministry	Liberal Arts & Humanities (N=201)	Social Science (N=95)	Applied Science (N=8)	Business & Accounting (N=16)	Natural Science (N=14)
PERCENT					
Pastor, Suburban Church	42.29	30.53	50.00	50.00	42.85
Evangelist	12.44	4.21	12.50	6.25	21.43
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	10.98	20.00	25.00	0.00	14.29
Executive, Theological Education Board	10.45	18.93	0.00	12.50	21.43
Chaplain, Armed Services	7.99	1.05	12.50	18.75	0.00
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	6.99	6.32	0.00	12.50	0.00
President of a Denomination	4.98	11.58	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to a Shopping Center	3.88	7.38	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 25 for more detail.

There was significant association between political preference and ministry desired ten years after training was completed (see Table 5.18). Suburban church pastor got highest response from all categories. Jazz artist and shopping center pastor were uniformly low.

TABLE 5.18.--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed,
According to Political Preference*

Type of Ministry	Political Preference		
	Conservative (N=271)	Liberal (N=271)	Independent (N=93)
PERCENT			
Pastor, Suburban Church	24.71	15.12	21.51
Seminary Instructor	18.45	11.81	8.60
Assoc. Pastor, Suburban Church	15.13	7.38	15.05
College Chaplain	8.12	14.76	17.20
Evangelist	7.01	2.58	6.45
Armed Service Chaplain	5.54	1.11	2.15
Exec., Bd. Theological Education	3.69	8.86	6.45
Ass't. Pastor, Suburban Church	3.32	3.69	1.08
Ass't. Pastor, Inner City Church	3.32	9.96	5.38
Ass't. Pastor, Urban Church	2.95	5.17	4.30
Pastor, Prisoners' Halfway House	2.58	2.58	2.15
Denomination President	1.85	4.06	4.30
Pastor Narcotics' Halfway House	1.48	4.06	0.00
Exec., Board of Church Vocations	1.11	2.21	2.15
Pastor to Jazz Artists	0.37	1.85	2.15
Shopping Center Pastor	0.37	4.80	1.08
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 26 and 27 for more detail.

Socioeconomic Factors and Expectations

4. Null Hypothesis: Seminarians with different socioeconomic characteristics will not differ significantly in their occupational specialization expectations.

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to the association between questions dealing with socioeconomic factors, and those dealing with occupational specialization expectations when seminarians graduated.

Significant association was found between type of ministry sure of when training was completed, and doctrinal position. Town and country pastor was high for conservatives and moderates. Racial group pastor was highest for liberals. Hospital chaplain, racial group pastor, and apartment ministry were frequently selected. Administrative and new ministries were generally chosen least (see Table 5.19).

There was significant association between seminarians feeling sure that the ministry would be their life work, and the type of ministry they were sure they could have when they graduated (.01 level). Town and country pastor were generally very high in frequency. This was true especially for those sure that the ministry would be their life work (see Table 5.20).

There was significant association (.01 level) between political preference, and ministry sure of when seminary training was completed (see Table 5.21). Town and country pastor was highest for all categories. Administrative ministries, worker priest, and ministerial specialties received scarcely any response.

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to the

TABLE 5.1.9.--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position*

Type of Ministry	Doctrinal Position		
	Conservative (N=323)	Moderate (N=172)	Liberal (N=155)
PERCENT			
Pastor, Town & Country	38.68	30.80	12.24
Hospital Chaplain	11.76	15.12	10.97
Pastor to a Racial Group	10.84	10.47	14.19
High-Rise Apartment Ministry	10.84	11.63	8.39
Director of Youth Work	5.57	4.65	10.32
Bishop	4.02	2.33	0.65
Ass't. Pastor, Town & Country	3.72	8.72	8.39
Industrial Chaplain	3.10	3.49	10.32
Blind School Chaplain	2.48	1.16	1.29
Executive, Evangelism Board	2.48	2.91	0.00
Executive, World Missions Board	2.48	1.74	1.94
Seminary Professor	1.86	0.58	4.52
Community Organization Director	1.55	2.33	6.45
Deaconness School Administrator	0.31	0.00	0.00
Worker Priest	0.31	2.91	9.68
Executive, Social Ministry Board	0.00	1.16	0.65
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 28 and 29 for more detail.

TABLE 5.20.--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry*

Type of Ministry	Sureness of Ministry		
	Sure (N=269)	Undecided (N=38)	Unsure (N=33)
	PERCENT		
Pastor, Town and Country	63.94	34.22	33.34
Director of Youth Work	12.64	21.05	9.09
Assistant Pastor, Town and Country	11.90	15.79	15.15
Worker Priest	4.09	7.89	15.15
Director for Community Organization	3.72	18.42	9.09
Seminary Professor	2.97	2.63	12.12
Executive, Social Ministry Board	0.37	0.00	6.06
Administrator, Deaconess School	0.37	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 30 for more detail.

association between questions dealing with socioeconomic factors, and those dealing with occupational specialization expectations ten years after graduation.

There was significant association (.01 level) between birth order and type of ministry seminarians were sure of ten years after graduation. Downtown pastor received over half the total response from all categories. Administrative specializations

TABLE 5.21.--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Political Preference *

Type of Ministry	Political Preference		
	Conservative (N=135)	Liberal (N=135)	Independent (N=46)
	PERCENT		
Pastor, Town and Country	73.34	46.67	45.64
Assistant Pastor, Town and Country	10.37	17.04	10.87
Director of Youth Work	9.63	13.33	19.57
Seminary Professor	3.70	2.22	6.52
Administrator, Deaconness School	0.74	0.00	0.00
Worker Priest	0.74	10.37	8.70
Executive, Board of Social Ministry	0.74	0.00	4.35
Director, Community Organization	0.74	10.37	4.35
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 31 for more detail.

and new ministries got few tallies from each category (see Table 5.22).

There was significant association between type of ministry seminarians were sure they could have ten years after they graduated, and their feeling sure the ministry would be their life work (.01 level). Associate Pastor of an urban church was highest for those sure the ministry would be their life work. Director of religious affairs of a university was highest for those undecided, downtown church pastor

TABLE 5.22.--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed,
According to Birth Order *

Type of Ministry	Birth Order			
	1st (N=144)	2nd (N=84)	3rd (N=53)	Over 4 (N=57)
PERCENT				
Downtown Church Pastor	53.48	61.91	56.60	54.38
Children's Home Pastor	17.36	15.48	16.99	7.02
Executive, Parish Education Board	9.03	7.14	5.66	10.53
Executive, Press, Radio, Television	6.94	2.38	3.77	5.26
Executive, Interchurch Relations	4.86	7.14	9.43	12.28
Administrator, Council of Churches	4.86	0.00	0.00	3.51
Television Pastor	2.08	2.38	5.66	7.02
Race Track Pastor	1.39	3.57	1.89	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 32 for more detail.

highest for those unsure. Those sure the ministry would be their life work far outnumbered the other categories. Chaplain of a seamen's home received no responses (see Table 5.23).

There was significant association (.01 level) between undergraduate major, and ministry sure of ten years after graduation (see Table 5.24). Most seminarians were liberal arts or social science majors. Liberal arts majors tallied highest for downtown church

TABLE 5.23.--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed,
According to Sureness of Ministry*

Type of . Ministry	Sureness of Ministry		
	Sure (N=533)	Undecided (N=74)	Unsure (N=63)
	PERCENT		
Associate Pastor, Urban Church	22.32	9.46	7.94
Downtown Church Pastor	18.76	17.57	20.64
Television Pastor	10.51	1.35	0.00
Director of Religious Affairs	9.94	22.98	20.64
Executive, Bd. of Youth Ministry	9.57	10.81	7.94
Executive, Bd. Interchurch Relations	8.26	1.35	6.35
Children's Home Chaplain	4.69	9.46	12.70
Pastor to Night People	4.13	4.05	7.94
Exec., Bd. Press, Radio, Tv	3.56	8.11	3.17
Executive, Bd. Parish Education	2.81	9.46	3.17
Administrator, Council of Churches	1.31	2.70	0.00
Pastor to a Leper Colony	1.13	0.00	3.17
Retarded Children's Home Chaplain	1.13	2.70	3.17
Pastor to Seamen	1.13	0.00	0.00
Race Track Pastor	0.75	0.00	3.17
Chaplain, Seamen's Home	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 33 and 34 for more detail.

pastor, while social science majors were highest for television pastor.

This ministry was also highest in count for applied science majors as well as those majoring in business and accounting and natural science.

Lowest were ministries to seamen and lepers.

There was significant association between political preference and ministry sure of ten years after graduation (see Table 5.25).

Downtown church pastor received a very high response from all categories: conservatives gave nearly three-fourths of their votes, liberals over fifty percent, and independents nearly fifty percent. Administrative and new ministries were low for all categories of political preference.

TABLE 5.25. Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed

Type of Ministry	Undergraduate Major	Liberal Arts	Science	Business	Other
Downtown Church Pastor	36.4	13.4	1.3	1.3	1.3
Pastor to Night People	13.4	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Chaplain, in various children's homes	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Director of religious affairs	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Chaplain of a children's home	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Chaplain of a seaman's home	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Executive, various education boards	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Urban Church Associate Pastor	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Executive, Bd. Interscholar Relations	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Executive, Bd. Press, Radio, Television	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Televisionist Pastor	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Senior Youth Pastor	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Executive, Board of Youth Ministry	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Administrative, Council of Churches	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3

TABLE 5.24.--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Undergraduate Major

Type of Ministry	Undergraduate Major				
	Liberal Arts & Humanities (N=397)	Social Science (N=194)	Applied Science (N=16)	Business & Accounting (N=26)	Natural Science (N=29)
	PERCENT				
Downtown Church Pastor	30.48	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to Night People	15.62	4.12	0.00	3.85	3.45
Chaplain, Retarded Children's Home	14.11	1.55	0.00	0.00	6.90
Director of Religious Affairs	9.82	14.95	18.75	11.54	20.69
Chaplain of a Children's Home	7.05	5.67	0.00	3.85	3.45
Chaplain of a Seamen's Home	5.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Executive, Parish Education Board	3.78	2.58	0.00	3.85	0.00
Urban Church Associate Pastor	3.78	18.56	18.75	23.08	13.79
Executive, Bd. Interchurch Relations	3.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Executive, Bd. Press, Radio, Television	2.02	3.09	0.00	0.00	3.45
Television Pastor	1.76	27.83	37.50	23.06	27.58
Race Track Pastor	0.76	6.70	6.25	15.38	13.79
Executive, Board of Youth Ministry	0.76	10.82	12.50	11.54	3.45
Administrator, Council of Churches	0.50	2.58	6.25	3.85	0.00

TABLE 5.24.--Continued.

Type of Ministry	Undergraduate Major				
	Liberal Arts & Humanities (N=397)	Social Science (N=194)	Applied Science (N=16)	Business & Accounting (N=26)	Natural Science (N=29)
Pastor to a Leper Colony	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.45
Pastor to Seamen	0.50	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 35 and 36 for more detail.

TABLE 5.25.--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed
According to Political Preference*

Type of Ministry	Political Preference		
	Conservative (N=134)	Liberal (N=135)	Independent (N=44)
	PERCENT		
Downtown Church Pastor	70.15	53.33	45.44
Children's Home Chaplain	13.43	15.56	15.91
Executive, Parish Education Board	5.22	8.15	22.73
Television Pastor	3.73	1.48	4.55
Executive, Bd. Press, Radio, and Television	3.73	5.19	4.55
Executive, Bd. of Interchurch Relations	2.24	8.89	4.55
Race Track Pastor	0.75	2.96	0.00
Administrator, Council of Churches	0.75	4.44	2.27
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 37 for more detail.

Socioeconomic Factors and Influences

5. Null Hypothesis: Seminaries with different socioeconomic characteristics will not differ significantly in influences perceived as affecting their decision to enter seminary.

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to the association between questions dealing with socioeconomic factors, and perceived influences.

There was significant association between class in seminary, and influence both of divine call and concern for community problems (see Table 5.26). Most influence was very high for divine call. This influence was related negatively to class in seminary. Concern for

TABLE 5.26.--Class in Seminary, According to Perceived Influence by Extent of Influence *

Class in Seminary	Most Influence		Least Influence	
	Divine Call (N=242)	Community Problems (N=107)	Divine Call (N=41)	Community Problems (N=93)
PERCENT				
First Year	38.43	37.38	36.58	41.94
Second Year	33.47	39.25	29.27	31.18
Third Year	19.01	9.35	9.76	20.43
Last Year	9.09	14.02	24.39	6.45
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 38 and 39.

community problems had slightly more most than least responses. Most influence responses of this type were much less for upper class seminarians.

There was significant association (.01 level) between birth order and perceived influence of a brother (see Table 5.27). Least influence of a brother was negatively related to birth order. Extent of least influence declined with birth order, and least influence was much greater in extent than most influence.

TABLE 5.27.--Birth Order, According to Influence of a Brother on Decision to Enter Seminary*

Birth Order	Most Influence (N=10)	Least Influence (N=204)
	PERCENT	
First	0.00	44.60
Second	10.00	21.57
Third	40.00	15.20
Fourth and Over	50.00	18.63
Total	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 40.

There was significant association between size of place, and perceived influence of community problems, wife or girl friend, and father (see Table 5.28). Community problems had by far the largest number of most influence responses. This influence was present most for seminarians from cities 500,000 and over. Most influence of wife was large for those from farms. Father's influence was strongest for

TABLE 5.28.--Size of Place, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence*

Size of Place	Most Influence			Least Influence		
	Community Problems (N=107)	Wife (N=48)	Father (N=44)	Community Problems (N=93)	Wife (N=209)	Father (N=185)
PERCENT						
500,000- over	37.38	10.42	13.64	19.35	26.32	23.78
100,000- 499,999	10.28	8.33	4.55	10.75	10.05	11.89
50,000- 99,999	11.21	6.25	13.64	5.38	9.09	5.95
25,000- 49,999	5.61	4.17	2.27	10.75	8.13	8.65
10,000- 24,999	7.48	8.33	2.27	9.68	8.61	9.19
2,500- 9,999	14.02	10.42	25.00	10.75	11.48	8.11
Village or Small Town	4.67	8.33	18.18	13.99	9.57	11.89
Farm or Open Country	9.35	43.75	20.45	19.35	16.75	20.54
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 41-43 for more detail.

those from farm, village, and cities under 10,000 people.

There was significant association between perceived influence and doctrinal position (see Table 5.29). Divine Call was highest in response for conservatives, as was influence of duty and father. Significant others received few most influence tallies, as did concern for community problems. Desire to help people was strongest for

TABLE 5.29.--Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence, According to Doctrinal Position *

Extent of Influence (Most Influence)	Doctrinal Position		
	Conservative (N=440)	Moderate (N=177)	Liberal (N=162)
	PERCENT		
Divine Call	36.59	28.25	16.05
Desire to Help People	24.09	31.64	34.57
Duty	14.32	11.30	9.26
Community Problems	5.68	16.38	30.25
Father	7.05	4.52	3.70
Mother	6.82	2.26	3.70
Wife or Girl Friend	5.45	5.65	2.47
Boy Scout Leader	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 44-51 for more detail.

liberals and moderates.

There was significant association between education and perceived influence of both father and mother (see Table 5.30). Least influences were much greater than most. Most influence responses were positively related to extent of education through completion of high school. Most influence was highest for fathers having post-graduate work.

There was significant association between age of decision to study for the ministry, and perceived influence of community problem concern, father, and mother (see Table 5.31). Concern for community problems was highest of the most influence categories. Most influence

TABLE 5.30.--Extent of Education, According to Perceived Influence,
by Extent of Influence *

Extent of Education	Most Influence		Least Influence	
	Father (N=44)	Mother (N=44)	Father (N=181)	Mother (N=183)
PERCENT				
Post- Graduate	47.72	9.09	7.73	0.55
College Graduate	9.09	18.18	9.39	6.56
Some College	13.64	25.00	14.92	19.13
High School	18.18	31.82	22.66	33.32
9th-11th Grade	4.55	4.55	11.05	15.85
8th Grade	0.00	9.09	19.89	16.94
Under 8 Grades	6.82	2.27	14.36	7.65
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 52 and 53 for more detail.

responses were less than least responses for both parents. Most seminarians decided to study for the ministry during college and high school. Extent of most influence increased with age at decision, peaking during college.

There was significant association between sureness of ministry and perceived influence of divine call, desire to help people, wife or girl friend, and Boy Scout leader. Most influence was very strongly related to sureness of ministry, especially for influence of a divine

TABLE 5.31.--Age of Decision to Study for the Ministry, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence*

Age of Decision	Most Influence			Least Influence		
	Community Problems (N=104)	Father (N=45)	Mother (N=41)	Community Problems (N=92)	Father (N=180)	Mother (N=146)
PERCENT						
After College	16.35	2.22	0.00	15.22	17.22	22.61
During College	53.84	46.67	41.45	46.74	51.67	51.37
After High School	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.52	5.00	5.48
During High School	22.12	31.11	34.15	20.65	22.22	18.49
Between 10 and 13	6.73	8.89	12.20	8.70	3.33	1.37
Under 10	0.96	11.11	12.20	2.17	0.56	0.68
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 54-56 for more detail.

call as well as that of a desire to help people. Significant motivations were much stronger in the most influence category (see Table 5.32).

TABLE 5.32.--Sureness of Ministry, According to Perceived Influence, by Extent of Influence*

Sureness of Ministry	Most Influence				Least Influence			
	Divine Call (N=239)	Desire to Help People (N=222)	Wife or Girl Friend (N=35)	Boy Scout Leader (N=0)	Divine Call (N=40)	Desire to Help People (N=21)	Wife or Girl Friend (N=194)	Boy Scout Leader (N=332)
	PERCENT							
Sure	87.87	80.18	91.43	0.00	57.50	100.00	86.08	79.82
Undecided	7.11	10.36	5.71	0.00	17.50	0.00	12.37	11.45
Unsure	5.02	9.46	2.86	0.00	25.00	0.00	1.55	8.73
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Tables 57-60 for more detail.

Relations Among Socioeconomic Factors

6. Null Hypothesis: Selected socioeconomic characteristics of seminarians will not differ significantly with class in seminary.

To test the hypothesis, the chi-square test was applied to the association between questions dealing with such factors as seminary, size of place, present marital state, political preference, doctrinal position, age of decision to study for the ministry, sureness of ministry for one's life work, and participation in activities while in college.

There was significant association between class in seminary and present marital state (see Table 5.33). The two dominant categories were married and never married, respectively. Lowest was widowed.

Never married was negatively associated with class in seminary, but

TABLE 5.33.--Marital State, According to Class in Seminary*

Marital State	Class in Seminary			
	First Year (N=138)	Second Year (N=115)	Third Year (N=60)	Last Year (N=48)
	PERCENT			
Widowed	0.72	0.00	0.00	0.00
Separated or Divorced	0.00	0.87	1.67	2.10
Married	47.84	55.65	71.67	70.80
Engaged	10.14	5.22	1.66	2.10
Never Married	41.30	38.26	25.00	25.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 61 for more detail.

this relation was less so for engaged. There was a positive relation between class and marriage.

There was significant association (.01 level) between class in seminary and doctrinal position. Conservatives scored highest, with middle of the roaders and liberals close. The conservative position was negatively related to class, while the liberal and moderate views were related positively (see Table 5.34).

TABLE 5.34.--Doctrinal Position, According to Class in Seminary*

Doctrinal Position	Class in Seminary			
	First Year (N=134)	Second Year (N=115)	Third Year (N=60)	Last Year (N=47)
PERCENT				
Conservative	60.45	48.70	56.67	14.90
Middle of the Road	17.16	26.95	25.00	46.80
Liberal	22.39	24.35	18.33	38.30
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 62 for more detail.

7. Null Hypothesis: Selected socioeconomic characteristics of seminarians will not differ significantly with extent of participation in church activities while in college.

• There was significant association (.01 level) between age of decision to study for the ministry, and extent of participation in church activities while in college (see Table 5.35). Most respondents were very much or moderately active, and decided to study for the ministry during high school or college. Complete lack of participation was related positively to age of decision. High participation was related positively to age until after high school. Moderate and slight participation were high and varied little with age of decision.

TABLE 5.35.--Participation in Church Activities while in College,
According to Age of Decision to Study for the Ministry*

Extent of Participation	Before Ten (N=8)	Ten to Thirteen (N=23)	During High School (N=81)	After High School (N=9)	During College (N=174)	After College (N=26)
PERCENT						
Very Much	37.50	34.79	37.04	66.67	27.59	26.92
Moderate	50.00	30.43	25.92	11.11	30.46	30.78
Slightly	12.50	30.43	29.63	22.22	32.18	26.92
Not at All	0.00	4.35	7.41	0.00	9.77	15.38
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 63 for more detail.

There was significant association between sureness that the ministry would be one's life work, and extent of participation in

church activities while in college (see Table 5.36). High involvement was strongly related to sureness of ministry. Relatively few responses were recorded for the undecided and unsure categories, and these were of slight or no involvement. Those sure were divided about equally among slight, moderate and much extent of participation.

TABLE 5.36.--Participation in Church Activities While in College,
According to Sureness of Ministry*

Extent of Participation	Sureness of Ministry		
	Sure (N=279)	Undecided (N=40)	Unsure (N=34)
	PERCENT		
Very Much	31.90	20.00	20.59
Moderate	31.18	20.00	23.53
Slightly	30.11	45.00	32.35
Not at All	6.81	15.00	23.53
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

*See Appendix B, Table 64 for more detail.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General Summary

The study investigated the relation between influences perceived by seminarians, and their occupational specialization. The basic objective was to explore the nature and extent of this relation. Reference group literature was reviewed, as were works dealing with occupational specialization of medical and ministerial studies. The theoretical frame of reference was taken from Mead and Sherif. Research hypotheses were derived from the review of literature and the theoretical model.

A questionnaire was developed, pretested on preseminary students at Valparaiso University in February 1970, and refined and revised.

Respondents for the study were students from 9 midwestern seminaries in the Chicago-St. Louis area. In April 1970, 366 seminarians were interviewed, completing questionnaires in a group setting. The data collected provided the basis for analysis. The testing of the hypotheses yielded the following results.

Hypothesis I

There was significant association between type of ministry desired when seminarians graduated and influence perceived from a minister and a divine call. Divine call was associated with a very strong feeling of perceived influence. Rank order and frequency of ministerial types were nearly identical. There was significant

association between type of ministry and influence perceived from a divine call, wife or girl friend, and youth leader. Rank order of ministerial types was identical for all types of influence. There was significant association between type of ministry desired by seminarians ten years after they graduated and influence perceived from a church councilman and from a feeling of duty. Ranking of ministries was identical, regardless of type of influence. Most influence was twice as strong for divine call as for duty. Both far outshone perceived influence of councilman, which was negligible.

Hypothesis II

There was significant association between type of ministry expected by seminarians when they graduated and influence perceived from a religion teacher, concern for community problems, and a divine call. Rank order of ministries was identical for the first two influences. Town and country pastor was highest in frequency for most and least influence. There was significant association between type of ministry seminarians expected ten years after graduation and influence perceived from a feeling of duty, councilman, and brother. Associate pastor ranked highest for all categories of influence. Feeling of duty had the highest number of most influence responses. There was a near-unanimous feeling of least as compared to most influence of significant others, except for minister. Significant motivations, in contrast, were strongly related to most influence.

Hypothesis III

Significant association was found to exist between type of

ministry seminarians desired when they graduated and doctrinal position. Town and country associate pastor was highest in frequency for both conservatives and moderates. Counseling ministries were highest for liberals. There was significant association between seminarians' feeling sure that the ministry would be their life work and type of ministry. Town and country associate pastor and downtown church assistant pastor were highest. There was significant association between political preference and type of ministry. Conservatives had the same number of responses as liberals. Town and country pastor was highest for all categories. Foreign missionary was high for conservatives. There was significant association between class in seminary and type of ministry desired by seminarians ten years after graduation. Suburban church pastor received the highest number of tallies for all classes except the second year. There was significant association between doctrinal position and type of ministry. Suburban church pastor was highest for conservatives and moderates. Liberals responded highest to college chaplain. There was significant association between certainty that the ministry would be one's life work and type of ministry. Suburban church pastor was highest for those sure and unsure the ministry would be their life work. The vast majority was sure it would be. There was significant association between undergraduate major and type of ministry as well as between political preference and type of ministry.

Hypothesis IV

There was significant association between type of ministry expected by seminarians when they graduated and doctrinal position.

Town and country pastor were high for conservatives and moderates. Racial group pastor was highest for liberals. There was significant association between sureness of ministry as one's life work, and type of ministry. Town and country pastor was high for all categories of certainty, particularly for those who felt sure the ministry would be their life work. There was significant association between political preference and type of ministry. Town and country pastor was highest for all categories of preference. There was significant association between birth order and type of ministry expected by seminarians ten years after they graduated. Downtown church pastor got over half the response for each category. There was significant association between sureness of ministry as one's life work and type of ministry. Urban church associate pastor was highest for those sure the ministry would be their life work. Director of religious affairs was highest for those undecided, and, with downtown church pastor, highest for those unsure. There was significant association between undergraduate major and type of ministry. Liberal arts majors scored highest for downtown church pastor. Social science majors were highest for television pastor. This ministry also got highest score from applied science, business, and natural science majors. There was significant association between political preference and type of ministry. Downtown church pastor received a very high response from all categories. Conservatives scored highest, but liberals lowest (though these gave about fifty percent of their votes to this ministry).

Hypothesis V

There was significant association between class in seminary and influence perceived from a divine call and concern for community problems. Most influence for both types of influence was related negatively to class in seminary. Significant association was found between birth order and influence perceived from a brother. Such influence was negatively related to birth order. Significant association existed between size of place and influence perceived by seminarians from concern for community problems, wife or girl friend, and father. Most influence of concern for community problems was highest for those from cities of 500,000 and over. This type of influence was by far dominant over most felt influence of wife or father. Most influence of wife was highest for those from a farm background. There was significant association between doctrinal position and perceived influence. Divine call got the highest most influence responses. Desire to help people got the greatest most influence responses for moderates and liberals. Most influence of divine call, duty, and father were highest for conservatives, less so for moderates, and least for liberals. The reverse was true for desire to help people, and concern for community problems. Significant association existed between education and perceived influence of both parents. Extent of most influence was high when both mother and father completed high school. Most influence was highest for fathers who had some post-graduate work. Significant association existed between age of decision to study for the ministry and perceived influence of concern for community problems, father, and mother.

Extent of most influence increased with age of decision through the college period, being highest during college, and relatively high during high school for all influences. There was significant association between certainty that the ministry would be one's life work and perceived influence of divine call, desire to help people, wife or girl friend, and scout leader. Most influence was very strongly related to feeling sure the ministry would be one's life work, regardless of type of influence but especially for divine call.

Hypotheses VI and VII

There was significant association between class in seminary and present marital state. The married category was highest in frequency for all classes, and increased in strength with class. There was significant association between class in seminary and doctrinal position. The conservative position, very strong for freshmen, was negatively related to class. The reverse was true for moderates and liberals. There was significant association between age of decision to study for the ministry and extent of participation in church activities while in college. High participation was related positively to age until after high school. Moderate and slight participation were high and differed slightly with age of decision. There was significant association between feeling sure that the ministry would be one's life work and extent of participation in church activities while in college. Relatively few responses were recorded for the undecided and unsure categories. These were mainly of slight or no participation. Those sure the ministry would be their life work were equally divided between much, moderate, and little participation.

Variables Not Found Significant

There was lack of significant association involving significant others. These included father, mother, best friend, and Boy Scout leader. Nor was desire to help people related to occupational specialization. No significant association was present between family size and specialization. Nor was there any such relation between specialization and size of place, parents' education, or age of definite decision to study for the ministry. There was generally no significant association between class in seminary and perceived influence of significant others. None held between class in seminary and political preference, age of decision to study for the ministry, and feeling sure that the ministry would be one's life work. Nor was there any between size of place and age of decision as well as feeling sure the ministry would be one's life work, between age of decision and extent and nature of college activities, and between feeling sure the ministry would be one's life work, and extent of college activities.

Conclusions

Significant association was found to exist for all the hypotheses. It was therefore possible to state the following conclusions:

1. There was significant association between influences perceived as significant by seminarians and their occupational specialization aspirations.
2. There was significant association between influences perceived as significant by seminarians and their occupational specialization expectations.

3. There was significant association between socioeconomic factors and occupational specialization aspirations.

4. There was significant association between socioeconomic factors and occupational specialization expectations.

5. There was significant association between socioeconomic factors and influences perceived by seminarians as significant.

6. There was significant association between socioeconomic factors.

TABLE 6.1.--Associations Found to be Significant

Association	Chi-square	DF	P
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Influence of Minister	106.39250	49	.01
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Divine Call Influence	73.86542	49	.05
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Divine Call Influence	76.97279	49	.01
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Influence of Wife	91.67302	49	.01
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Youth Leader Influence	105.53593	49	.01
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Councilman Influence	79.18454	49	.01
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Divine Call Influence	84.83688	49	.01
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Influence of Duty	72.63152	49	.05
Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, and Religion Teacher Influence	67.02577	49	.05
Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, and Divine Call Influence	105.16766	49	.01
Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, and Community Problems Concern	74.22177	49	.05
Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, and Influence of Duty	58.31616	42	.05
Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training, and Councilman Influence	87.39751	49	.01
Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training, and Brother Influence	230.34125	56	.01
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Doctrinal Position	86.04026	21	.01
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Doctrinal Position	52.22751	21	.01
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Sureness of Ministry	181.90779	35	.01
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Sureness of Ministry	60.71535	35	.01
Ministry Desired When Training Completed, and Political Preference	74.03967	35	.01
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Class in Seminary	33.42259	21	.05
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Class in Seminary	166.44495	24	.01
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Doctrinal Position	58.53277	21	.01
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Doctrinal Position	79.56043	21	.01
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Sureness of Ministry	69.96635	35	.01
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Undergraduate Major	87.86869	56	.01
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Political Preference	54.25760	35	.05
Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training, and Political Preference	82.72185	35	.01

TABLE 6.1--Continued

Association	Chi-square	DF	P
Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, and Doctrinal Position	96.36705	21	.01
Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, and Doctrinal Position	35.73698	21	.05
Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, and Sureness of Ministry	76.52083	35	.01
Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, and Political Preference	87.29063	35	.01
Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training, and Birth Order	70.30133	42	.01
Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training, and Sureness of Ministry	55.36177	30	.01
Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training, and Sureness of Ministry	126.97906	35	.01
Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training, and Undergraduate Major	154.98354	56	.01
Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training, and Undergraduate Major	229.60356	64	.01
Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training, and Political Preference	56.59439	35	.05
Influence of Concern for Community Problems, and Class in Seminary	37.38643	18	.01
Influence of a Divine Call, and Class in Seminary	30.83661	18	.05
Influence of Brother, and Birth Order	77.60052	36	.01
Influence of a Wife, Girl Friend or Fiancee, and Size of Place	74.83119	48	.01
Influence of a Father, and Size of Place	67.22931	48	.05
Influence of Concern for Community Problems, and Size of Place	91.44687	48	.01
Influence of a Wife, Girl Friend or Fiancee, and Doctrinal Position	32.84521	18	.01
Influence of a Father, and Doctrinal Position	36.78428	18	.01
Influence of a Mother, and Doctrinal Position	41.82835	18	.01
Influence of a Boy Scout Leader, and Doctrinal Position	25.07809	0	.01
Influence of a Desire to Help People, and Doctrinal Position	32.11919	18	.05
Influence of Concern for Community Problems, and Doctrinal Position	108.34995	18	.01
Influence of Duty, and Doctrinal Position	35.12792	18	.01
Influence of Divine Call, and Doctrinal Position	128.20851	18	.01
Influence of Father, and Father's Education	100.68938	48	.01
Influence of a Father, and Mother's Education	65.76602	48	.05
Influence of a Father, and Age of Decision to Study for the Ministry	87.81633	42	.01
Influence of a Mother, and Age of Decision to Study for the Ministry	97.53979	42	.01
Influence of Concern for Community Problems, and Age of Decision	65.08154	42	.05

TABLE 6.1.---Continued

Association	Chi-square	DF	P
Influence of a Wife, Girl Friend or Fiance, and Sureness of Ministry	43.95906	30	.05
Influence of a Boy Scout Leader, and Sureness of Ministry	29.30272	15	.05
Influence of a Desire to Help People, and Sureness of Ministry	50.81644	30	.05
Influence of a Divine Call, and Sureness of Ministry	115.42287	30	.01
Present Marital State, and Class in Seminary	28.59610	15	.05
Doctrinal Position, and Class in Seminary	32.01505	6	.01
College Church Activity Participation, and Age of Decision	126.29105	28	.01
College Church Activity Participation, and Sureness of Ministry	29.59073	15	.05

Contributions

One of the main results of this study was the finding concerning reference persons. All but one of the reference persons were felt to be of slight influence on the individual's decision to enter seminary. The one exception was the minister. In contrast, reference motivations were perceived by seminarians as strongly influencing their decision to enter seminary. This was particularly true for the feeling of a divine call and concern for social and community problems.

Prominent associations were found for doctrinal position and political preference. Though all three positions on doctrine gave considerable response to traditional ministries (general parish roles), conservatives gave these greater weight. Liberals gave more emphasis to new ministries, specializations of the parish ministry, and administrative types. A similar pattern was evident for political preference. Generally, all groups of preference gave strong emphasis to the traditional parish ministry, moderate emphasis to specializations of that ministry, and slight response to new ministries.

Another contribution was the finding concerning occupational specializations. A basic "reality perception" was present here. The traditional pastoral ministry was most frequently indicated. Most ministerial employment is found in this type of ministry. Specializations of this ministry, such as director of counseling and of religious education, got moderate response. Fewer jobs are available in this type of ministry. New ministries (such as those to addicts and to people in high-rise apartments) have received much publicity in the press but actually offer few opportunities for employment. These

types got slight response.

As a result of the evidence regarding choice of occupational specialization, it was possible to expand the two-fold typology of ministerial specialization previously stated and developed by Scherer¹ to include four categories (see Appendix D). This four-fold typology includes not only the traditional, generalized parish ministry and traditional ministerial specializations, such as chaplaincies and foreign missionaries, but also covers specializations of the parish ministry as well as the new ministries previously mentioned.

There were several methodological contributions resulting from the study. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) was a unique instrument in that it focused simultaneously on reference persons and motivations as well as occupational goals. The ministerial occupation specialization scale (see Appendix C) was an original attempt to rate and rank various ministerial specializations. The relating of reference group theory and occupational specializations desired and expected by seminarians was a contribution to contemporary sociological theory.

Limitations of the Study

While this study made contributions to both theory and methodology, certain limitations must be recognized. This research was limited by the fact that not all denominations were represented, and also that findings from this study were restricted to seminaries in the Chicago-St. Louis area. Dealt with were impressions of those

¹Scherer, loc. cit.

undergoing training for a profession. Impressions as such tend to be inherently subjective, whether or not they are related to occupational choice. Seminararians thus may aspire to and expect to work in a given type of ministry. Such aspirations and expectations may change considerably once they actually enter the ministry. Occupational goals may also be altered by taking additional course work or acquiring a graduate degree.

Recommendations

The present study examined whether there was significant relation between significant others and motivations perceived as influencing a seminarian to enter seminary and his occupational specialization. Reviewing the results of the study, the question emerges as to why there was basically little influence from significant others. It could have been due to the declining effect of the family as a reference group. Thus, father, mother, and brother were of slight effect because the student, already when he entered college, related increasingly to a new set of reference persons and groups. Youth leader, religion teacher, and church councilman could be explained similarly. They were of slight influence because the local congregation as a reference group, and reference persons within it, had been replaced with reference groups and persons, particularly with entrance into college. The minister (not necessarily the respondent's original local parish minister) was moderately important as a reference person, possibly because he represented the occupation generally and also might have been a friend.

Future step would be to explore in greater detail the relation of the minister, in general and particular, in the present experience of the seminarian. It would be interesting to focus on the immediate setting of the seminarian's experience, to investigate whether there is significant relation between significant others within the seminary setting (professors, field work supervisors, classmates, roommates, best liked classmate) and the seminarian's expected and desired occupational specializations.

The strong influence of seminarians perceived from such motivations as desire to help people and concern for community problems would indicate another area which deserves investigating. Such strong influence from motivations may be connected with an indirect effect of reference groups such as family and local congregation.

The nature of frequencies given to traditional, new and specialized ministries would suggest a second in depth at each of these categories. Open-ended questions could be used to see to what extent a given seminarian's attraction to a certain ministerial specialty reflected meaningful reference individuals and groups. It might be that the new, non-parish ministries were relatively unknown, or were perceived as areas where there was little employment, as the literature suggested. Journalistic attention to these types of ministry might not have reflected real interest on the part of those planning to enter the ministry.

There is the challenge of investigating the possibility of patterned variations within and between classes in a given seminary and between seminaries. A key area that could be examined is that of

possible attitudinal changes evident after the year of field work as compared to before, particularly in relation to the student's attitude to perceived influences (significant others) and types of specialization.

Another direction research could take would be a comparing of seminarians' job types after graduation, with that after five, ten, and fifteen years. This might offer insight as to whether there is a significant relationship between job expectations and aspirations, and the actual specializations he obtains.

The occupational patterns of those leaving the ministry might be examined as could the profiles of men dropping out of the seminary. One could study those perceived as significant others by them, as well as their occupational specializations. What routes seem to emerge as paths out of the ministry and seminary? What types of work do these men go into when they leave?

One last area which could be interesting and fruitful would be a study of the significant others and specializations of tent ministers i.e. those obtaining some or no compensation as they perform parish and non-parish ministerial functions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

1. Bridston, Keith and Culver, Dwight W. Pre-Seminary Education: Report of the Lilly Endowment Study. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965.
2. Cooley, Charles H. Social Organization. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.
3. Davis, James A. Undergraduate Career Decisions: Correlates of Occupational Choice. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.
4. Dean, Dwight G., and Valdes, Donald M. Experiments in Sociology. New York: Appleton Century Crafts, 1967.
5. Durkheim, Emile. The Division of Labor in Society. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960. (First printed in 1933. Translated by George Simpson).
6. Festinger, Leon. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1968. (First published 1957 by Row, Peterson and Company).
7. Hadden, Jeffrey K. The Gathering Storm in the Churches. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1969).
8. Himes, Joseph S. The Study of Sociology: An Introduction. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.
9. Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1950.
10. Hyman, Herbert H. and Singer, Eleanor. (eds.). Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
11. Johnson, Harry M. Sociology: A Systematic Introduction. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1960.
12. Keller, Suzanne. Beyond the Ruling Class: Strategic Elites in Modern Society. New York: Random House, Inc., 1963. (First paperback edition in 1968).
13. Luckmann, Thomas. The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1967.

14. Mead, George H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.
15. Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1968. (First published in 1949).
16. Merton, Robert K., Reader, George G., and Kendall, Patricia L. (eds.). The Student-Physician: Introductory Studies in the Sociology of Medical Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957.
17. Newcomb, T. M., Turner, Ralph H., and Converse. Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
18. Phillips, Bernard S. Social Research: Strategy and Tactics. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968.
19. Piaget, Jean. The Moral Judgement of the Child. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1948.
20. Pusey, Nathan M. and Taylor, Charles L. Ministry for Tomorrow. New York: Seabury Press, 1967.
21. Sherif, Muzafer and Sherif, Carolyn W. An Outline of Social Psychology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956. (Revised edition. First Printing, 1948).
22. _____. Reference Groups: Exploration into Conformity and Deviation of Adolescents. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.
23. Strauss, Murray A. and Nelson, Joel I. Sociological Analysis: An Empirical Approach Through Replication. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
24. Volkert, E. H. ed. Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951.
25. Winter, Gibson. Religious Identity: A Study in Religious Organization. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1961.

Articles and Periodicals

1. Back, Kurt W., Coker, Robert E., and Donnelly, Thomas G. "Public Health as a Career of Medicine: Secondary Choice Within a Profession," American Sociological Review, XXIII (1958), 533-541.
2. Bordua, David J. "Educational Aspirations and Parental Stress on College," Social Forces, XXXVIII (March 1960), 262-269.

3. Duncan, Otis Dudley, Haller, Archibald O., and Portes, Alejandro. "Peer Influence and Aspirations: A Reinterpretation," American Journal of Sociology, LXXIV (1968), 119-137.
4. Goodling, Richard A., and Webb, Sam C. "An Analysis of Faculty Ratings of Theology Students," Religious Education, LIV (1959), 228-233.
5. Hadden, Jeffrey K. "A Study of the Protestant Ministry of America," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, V (1965), 10-23.
6. Haller, Archibald O., and Butterworth, Charles E. "Peer Influences on Levels of Occupational and Educational Aspirations," Social Forces, XXXVIII (1960), 289-295.
7. Haller, Archibald O., and Sewell, William H. "Occupational Choices of Wisconsin Farm Boys," Rural Sociology, XXXIII (March, 1967) 37-55.
8. Kandel, Denise M., and Lesser, Gerald S. "Parental and Peer Influences on Educational Plans of Adolescents," American Sociological Review, XXXIV (April 1969), 213-222.
(Revision of a paper read before the Sixty-third Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, at Boston, Mass., August 1968).
9. ~~Ashover, Ross E., "The Role of the Family in the Development of the Individual,"~~ "Relative Influence of Parents and Peers on the Educational Plans of Adolescents," American Journal of Sociology, LXXIII (1968).
10. Katz, Fred E., and Martin, Harry W. "Career Choice Processes," Social Forces, XXXI (1963), 149-154.
11. Kemper, Theodore D. "Reference Groups, Socialization, and Achievement," American Journal of Sociology, LXXIII (1968).
12. Kuhn, Manford H. "The Reference Group," in Julius Gould and William L. Kolb (eds.). A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. New York: The Free Press, 1964, 580-581.
13. Larsen, William. "Specialized Ministries for Clergymen," Lutheran Quarterly, XVIII (1966), 136-143.
14. Levinson, Daniel J. "Medical Education and the Theory of Adult Socialization," Journal of Health and Social Behavior, VIII (December, 1967), 253-263.
15. Litwak, Eugene. "Reference Group Theory, Bureaucratic Career, and Neighborhood Primary Group Cohesion," Sociometry, XXIII (1960), 72-83.

16. Luecke, Richard. "Why Take an Honest Job if You Can Be a Minister." Religion and Life, XXXV (1966), 353-363.
17. Lutterman, Kenneth G., and Sewell, William H. "Effects of Parental Income, Education, and Occupation on Aspiration and Achievement. Paper read at Sixty-second Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, at San Francisco, Calif., August 1967.
18. Merton, Robert K., and Christie, Richard. "Procedures for the Sociological Study of the Values Climate of Medical Schools," Journal of Medical Education, Vol. 30, No. 10, (October 1958), 125-153.
19. Musgrave, P. W. "Toward a Sociological Theory of Occupational Choice," Sociological Review, XV (March 1967), 33-45.
20. Osborn, Ronald E. "Motivation for Ministerial Enlistment," Encounter, XXIII (1962), 62-77.
21. Phillips, Bernard S. "Expected Value Deprivation and Occupational Preference," Sociometry, XXVII (June, 1964), 151-160.
22. Rehberg, Richard A., and Westby, David L., "Parental Encouragement, Occupation, Education, and Family Size: Artifactual or Independent Determinants of Adolescent Education and Expectations,?" Social Forces, XLV (March, 1967), 362-374.
23. Scherer, Ross P. "Some Statistics on Church Personnel," in Ross P. Scherer and Theodore O. Wedel (eds.). The Church and its Manpower Management. New York: Department of Ministry of Vocation and Pastoral Services, National Council of Churches, (1966), 45-47.
24. Sewell, William H. "Community of Residence and College Plans," American Sociological Review, XXIV (February, 1964), 24-38.
25. Sewell, William H. and Armer, J. Michael. "Neighborhood Context and College Plans," American Sociological Review, XXXI (April, 1966), 159-168.
26. Sewell, William H., Haller, Archibald O., and Portes, Alejandro. "Education and Early Occupational Attainment Process," American Sociological Review, XXXIV, (February, 1969), 82-92.
27. Sewell, William H., Haller, Archibald O., and Strauss, Murray A. "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspirations," American Sociological Review, XXII (February, 1957), 67-73.

28. Sewell, William H., and Grenstein, Alan M. "Community of Residence and Occupational Choice," American Journal of Sociology LXX (March, 1965), 551-563.
29. Sewell, William H., and Shah, Vernal P. "Social Class, Parental Encouragement, and Educational Aspiration," American Journal of Sociology, LXXIII (March 1968), 559-572.
30. Sewell, William H., and Shah, Vernal P. "Socioeconomic Status, Intelligence, and the Attainment of Higher Education," Sociology of Education, XXXX (Winter, 1967), 1-23.
31. Sherlock, Asil, and Cohen, Alan. "Recruitment to Dentistry." Social Forces, XXXXIV (1965), 303-313.
32. Simpson, Richard L. "Parental Influence, Anticipatory Socialization and Social Mobility," American Sociological Review, XXVII (1962), 517-522.
33. Simpson, Richard L., and Simpson, Ida Harper. "Values, Personal Influence, and Occupational Choice," Social Forces, XXXVIII (1960), 116-125.
34. Slocum, Walter L. "Influence of Reference Group Values on Educational Aspirations of Rural High School Students," Rural Sociology, XXXII (September, 1967), 269-277.
35. Spaeth, Joe L. "Occupational Prestige Expectations Among Male College Graduates," American Journal of Sociology, LXXIII (March, 1968), 548-558.
36. Smith, James Otis, and Sjoberg, Gideon. "Origins and Career Patterns of Leading Protestant Clergymen," Social Forces, XXXIV (1960).
37. Stebbins, Robert A. "Career: The Subjective Approach," Sociological Quarterly 11, (Winter, 1970).
38. Timms, Duncan M.G. "Occupational Stratification and Friendship Norms: A Study in Brisbane," Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, III (April, 1967), 32-43.
39. Turner, Ralph H. "Role-Taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference-Group Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, LXI (1956), 316-328.

Bulletins

1. Drabick, Lawrence W. Perceived Sources of Influence Upon Occupational and Educational Expectations. Raleigh: North Carolina Agr. Exp. Sta. Progress Report 50, 1967.

2. Haller, Archibald O., and Miller, Irwin W. The Occupational Aspiration Scale. Second Printing, Department of Rural Sociology. University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1967. (First Printing: Agricultural Experiment Station Technical Bulletin 288. Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1963).
3. Lionberger, Herbert F., Gregory, C. I., and Chang, H. C. Educational Choices and Expectations of Male Students Entering a Midwestern University. Columbia: Missouri Agr. Exp. Sta. Research Bulletin 923, 1967.

Unpublished Material

1. Becker, Edwin Lewis. "Religious Field Work as Experience in the Social Roles of the Minister." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1956.
2. Berschied, Ellen. "Effects of Communicator-Communicatee Value Similarity and Dissimilarity Upon Opinion Change." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1965.
3. Colwell, C. A. "Motivations for Choosing the Christian Ministry as a Vocation." Unpublished B.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1952.
4. Dick, W. W. "Vocational Self-Concept in Terms of the Vocational Interests and Values of Seminarian and Ministers." Unpublished M.S. dissertation, University of Ottawa, 1964.
5. Floyd, H. Hugh, and South, Donald R. "Varied Reference Group Orientations of a Youth Population and Some Selected Correlates." Paper presented at the Southern Sociological Society Meeting, New Orleans, April 10, 1968.
6. George, Pulwehl Markose. "Occupational Choice of College Students; Centrality of Occupation and Evaluative-Cognitive Congruency." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1965.
7. Kanter, Stuart Alan. "Social Psychology of Premature Occupational Choice: An Investigation of Student Careers in an Undergraduate Engineering School." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan, 1968.
8. Krueger, Cynthia Sue. "Problems and Processes of Professional Socialization: The Student Nurses." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1967.

9. Larson, Wayne Lewis. "The Relationship Between Values and Educational Choices of High School Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1969.
10. Lindenthal, Jacob Jay. "The Delayed Decision to Enter the Ministry: A Study in Occupational Change." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1967.
11. New, Peter Kong-Ming, "The Application of Reference Group Theory to Shifts in Values: The Case of the Osteopathic Student." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1960.
12. Peters, George Robert. "Primary Friendship in the College Community: A Study of the Associations of Male Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.
13. Ruesnick, David Charles. "A Study of the Seminary Student's Perception of Practitioner Roles Performed by the Minister." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, 1967.
14. Scherer, Ross P. "Ministers of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod: Origins, Training, Careers, Lives, Place, Plans of Work and Reference." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963.

Other Sources

1. Department of Missions, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. Personal interviews with James Cross at Valparaiso, Indiana, June 7-8, 1969.
2. Department of Religion, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana. Personal interview with acting head, Dale Lasky, May 26, 1969.
3. Church Federation of Greater Chicago. Personal interview with head of research, Dr. Douglas Lewis, and his assistant, Vern Viscik. June 24, 1969.
4. _____. Phone conversation with Dr. Lewis. July 2, 1969.
5. Department of Education, Lutheran Church in America. Personal Correspondence with Rev. Albert Haversat.
6. Loyola University of Chicago. Personal interview with Dr. Ross P. Scherer, head of Sociology Department, at Arlington Heights, Illinois. May 31, 1969.

7. Lutheran School of Theology, Chicago. Personal interview with Dr. Franklin Sherman, Department of Social Ethics. June 27, 1969.

Appendix A
 Appendix A

Date: _____

1. The name of _____

2. My name is _____

1. _____

2. _____

3. My name is _____

4. My name is _____

1. _____

2. _____

5. My name is _____

1. _____

2. _____

6. My name is _____

1. _____

2. _____

7. My name is _____

1. _____

8. My name is _____

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

"Perceived Influences on the Occupational Specialization Aspirations and Expectations of Seminary Students"

Date: _____, 1970

Schedule Number: _____.

1. The name of my seminary is _____.

2. My class in seminary is (circle correct number):

1. first year

3. third year

2. second year

4. last year

3. My age at my last birthday was _____.

4. My racial group is (circle correct number):

1. White

3. Oriental

2. Black

4. American Indian

5. My sex is (circle correct number):

1. male

2. female

6. How many brothers and sisters do you have? If none, use a zero.

_____ brothers

_____ sisters

7. How many children were born in your family before you? Include all those ever born.

_____ born before me.

8. How large was the place you lived in most of the time before you were 18? Circle the correct number.

1. farm or open country

5. 25,000 to 49,999 people

2. village or small town

6. 50,000 to 99,999 people

3. 2,500 to 9,999 people

7. 100,000 to 499,999 people

4. 10,000 to 24,999 people

8. 500,000 and over

9. What is your present marital state? Circle the correct number.
- | | |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. never married | 5. divorced |
| 2. engaged | 6. widower or widowed |
| 3. married | 7. remarried |
| 4. separated | |
10. If married, circle the number of years married (to the last completed year)
- | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. less than one year | 4. five to ten years |
| 2. one to two years | 5. eleven to fifteen years |
| 3. three or four years | 6. over fifteen years |
11. How many children do you have? Circle the correct number.
- | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|
| 0. no children | 4. 4 children |
| 1. 1 child | 5. 5 children |
| 2. 2 children | 6. more than 5 children |
| 3. 3 children | |
12. Circle the number of the item closest to your political preference.
- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 1. Liberal Democrat | 4. Conservative Republican |
| 2. Conservative Democrat | 5. Other (specify: _____) |
| 3. Liberal Republican | _____ (more than 10 grades (post-_____)) |
13. Circle the number of the item which best represents your doctrinal position:
- | |
|-----------------------|
| 1. liberal |
| 2. conservative |
| 3. middle of the road |
14. List the type of work by which your father earned most of his income.
-

15. List the way in which your mother earned most of her income, if she worked outside of the home. If your mother did not work outside the home, check here: _____.

16. If you were reared by someone other than your parents for most of the time before you were 18, describe the work done by the person earning most of the income:

17. What was your feeling about your parent or guardian's work?
Circle the correct number.

1. liked it very much

4. disliked it somewhat

2. liked it somewhat

5. disliked it very much

3. indifferent

18. How did your mother's father earn most of his income?

19. How did your father's father earn most of his income?

20. What was the highest grade in school completed by your father?
Circle the correct number.

1. less than 8 grades

5. 13th, 14th or 15th grade
(some college)

2. 8th grade

6. 16th grade (college graduate)

3. 9th, 10th, or 11th grade

7. more than 16 grades (post-graduate work)

4. 12th grade

21. What was the highest grade in school completed by your mother?

1. less than 8 grades

5. 13th, 14th, or 15th grade
(some college)

2. 8th grade

6. 16th grade (college graduate)

3. 9th, 10th, or 11th grade

7. more than 16 grades (post-graduate work)

4. 12th grade

22. What type of work do you think your father would have done if he had been able to do what he really wanted to do?
-
23. What type of work do you think your mother would have done if she had been able to do what she really wanted to do?
-
24. Circle the number which correctly indicates the present marital situation of your parents:
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. both alive and living together | 5. mother not living |
| 2. both alive, separated | 6. neither mother nor father living |
| 3. both alive, divorced | 7. remarried |
| 4. father not living | |
25. When did you first think of becoming a minister, priest or clergyman? Circle the number which applies.
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. before the age of ten | 4. during college |
| 2. between ten and thirteen | 5. after college |
| 3. during high school | |
26. When did you definitely decide to study for the ministry or priesthood? Circle the number which applies.
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. before the age of ten | 4. during college |
| 2. between ten and thirteen | 5. after college |
| 3. during high school | |
27. How sure do you feel that the ministry or priesthood will be the kind of work you will do for most of the rest of your life? Circle the correct number.
- | | |
|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. very sure | 4. somewhat unsure |
| 2. somewhat sure | 5. very unsure |
| 3. undecided | |

28a. To what extent did you participate in activities while in college? Circle the number which applies.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. very much (5 or more activities per semester or quarter) | 3. slightly (1 or 2 activities) |
| 2. moderately (3 or 4 activities) | 4. not at all |

28b. What was the nature of the activity? Circle the number of the one in which you were most active.

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. sports and athletics | 4. social activities |
| 2. music | 5. special interest (specify: _____) |
| 3. political groups or clubs | _____ |

29a. To what extent did you participate in church activities while in college? Circle the number which applies.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. very much (5 or more activities) | 3. slightly (1 or 2 activities) |
| 2. moderately (3 or 4 activities) | 4. not at all |

29b. What was the nature of your activity? Circle the number of the one in which you were the most active.

- | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. choir | 3. Bible class |
| 2. student group | 4. other (specify: _____) |

30. Circle the number of the church position in which you were most active while in college:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1. church councilman, deacon, or trustee | 4. organist |
| 2. teacher in Sunday School, Vacation Bible School, or released time program | 5. usher |
| 3. youth group advisor | 6. officer in some church group |

31. Note the frequency of your attendance at worship services or mass or church while in college (circle the correct number).

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. at least once a week | 4. every three months |
| 2. twice a month | 5. every six months |
| 3. once a month | 6. less frequently than every six months |

32. If you worked while in college (including summers), indicate the type of work from which you earned most of your income.

33. If you are working or have worked while in seminary, indicate the type of work from which you earned most of your income.

34. If you entered seminary after working a considerable length of time, indicate the type of work from which you earned most of your income.

35. What was the most advanced or highest degree you received before entering this seminary? Circle the correct number.

- | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|
| 1. no degree | 5. M.S. |
| 2. B.A. | 6. Ph.D. |
| 3. B.S. | 7. Other (specify: _____) |
| 4. M.A. | _____) |

36. Indicate your undergraduate major

37. If you had graduate work before entering seminary, indicate your field or area of specialization.

In the following questions, you are asked to indicate the extent to which certain individuals influenced your decision to enter seminary. Circle the number which indicates the extent of influence as you recall it. The largest number (6) indicates the highest degree of influence, and zero (0) indicates the lowest extent of influence.

38. To what extent did a minister influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

39. To what extent did your wife, girl friend, or fiancée influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

40. To what extent did your brother influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

41. To what extent did your father influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

42. To what extent did your mother influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

43. To what extent did your best friend influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

44. To what extent did a Sunday School teacher or a parochial school teacher influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

45. To what extent did a youth group leader influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

46. To what extent did a church councilman, deacon or trustee influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

47. To what extent did a Boy Scout leader influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

48. To what extent did a desire to help people influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

49. To what extent did a concern for social and community problems influence your desire to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

50. To what extent did a feeling of duty or obligation influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

51. To what extent did a feeling that God called you influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

52. To what extent did the feeling that there was really no other alternative job or occupation influence your decision to enter seminary? Circle the number which applies.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

most
influence

least
influence

The next set of questions deals with your interest in different types of ministerial occupational specializations. Circle the number of your choice for each of the following questions. Do not make more than one choice per question.

53. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the best one you are really sure you can get when your seminary training is completed?

1. administrator of a deaconness' or parish workers' training school
2. worker priest
3. assistant pastor of a town and country church or parish
4. director of youth work in a congregation, church, or parish
5. executive of a denominational board of social ministry
6. professor in a theological seminary
7. director for community organization in a local church, congregation, or parish
8. pastor of a town and country church or parish

54. Of the jobs listed in this question, which one would you choose if you were free to choose any of them you wanted when your seminary training is completed? Circle the number which applies.

1. associate pastor of a town and country church or parish
2. director of religious education in a local congregation or parish
3. pastor of a coffee house
4. prison chaplain
5. chaplain of a retirement center
6. foreign missionary
7. veterans' chaplain
8. director of counseling in a local congregation or parish

55. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the best one you are really sure you can get when your seminary training is completed?

1. industrial chaplain
2. pastor to a racial group
3. pastor to high-rise apartments
4. chaplain of a school for the blind
5. hospital chaplain
6. bishop
7. executive of a denominational board of evangelism
8. executive of a denominational board of world missions

56. Of the jobs listed in this question, which one would you choose if you were free to choose any of them you wished when your seminary training is over? Circle the number which applies.

1. assistant pastor of a downtown church, congregation, or parish
2. executive of a denominational board of American missions
3. radio pastor
4. chaplain of a school for the deaf

5. pastor to an ethnic group
 6. pastor of an inner city church, congregation, or parish
 7. executive of a denominational board of stewardship
 8. pastor of a counseling center
57. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the best one you are really sure you can have ten years after you have completed your seminary training? Circle the number which applies.
1. pastor to night people
 2. executive of a denominational board of youth ministry
 3. chaplain of a seamen's home
 4. pastor to a leper colony
 5. associate pastor of an urban church
 6. chaplain of a home for mentally retarded children
 7. pastor to seamen (seamen's chaplain)
 8. director of religious affairs of a university
58. Of the jobs listed in this question, which one would you choose to have ten years after you have completed your seminary training, if you were free to have any of them you wished? Circle the number which applies.
1. associate pastor of a suburban church, congregation, or parish
 2. instructor in a theological seminary
 3. pastor to jazz artists
 4. pastor to a prisoners' halfway house
 5. executive of a denominational board for church vocations
 6. pastor to a narcotics' halfway house
 7. assistant pastor of an urban church, congregation, or parish
 8. college chaplain

59. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the best one you are really sure you can have ten years after completing your seminary training? Circle the number which applies.

1. television pastor
2. pastor of a downtown church, congregation or parish
3. pastor to race track people
4. chaplain of a children's home
5. executive of a denominational board of parish education
6. administrator of a council of churches
7. executive of a denominational board of press, radio, and television
8. executive of a denominational board of interchurch relations

60. Of the jobs listed in this question, which one would you choose to have ten years after you have completed your seminary training, if you were free to have any of them you wished? Circle the number which applies.

1. assistant pastor of a suburban church, congregation, or parish
2. executive of a denominational board of theological education
3. pastor to a shopping center
4. chaplain in the armed services
5. assistant pastor of an inner city church, congregation, or parish
6. president of a denomination
7. evangelist
8. pastor of a suburban church

TABLE 1. (Questions 38 and 54)--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Influence a Minister Had on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence 0 (N=33)	1 (N=37)	2 (N=45)	3 (N=45)	4 (N=57)	Most Influence 5 (N=56)	6 (N=73)	Other (N=2)
			PERCENT					
Associate Pastor, Town and Country	33.34	29.73	35.56	33.33	33.33	41.07	31.51	0.00
Director of Religious Education	6.06	18.92	6.67	8.90	17.54	12.50	6.84	0.00
Pastor of a Coffee House	6.06	16.22	15.56	11.11	3.51	8.93	13.70	0.00
Prison Chaplain	3.03	2.70	0.00	4.44	3.51	7.14	6.85	0.00
Chaplain, Retirement Center	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.51	0.00	0.00	0.00
Foreign Missionary	24.24	13.51	17.77	24.44	8.78	17.86	24.66	100.00
Veterans' Chaplain	27.27	0.00	4.44	0.00	1.75	0.00	2.74	0.00
Director of Counseling	0.00	18.92	20.00	17.78	28.07	12.50	13.70	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 106.39250

DF = 49

P < .01

TABLE 2. (Questions 51 and 54)--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Influence of a Divine Call on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence 0 (N=20)	1 (N=19)	2 (N=24)	3 (N=23)	4 (N=29)	5 (N=57)	Most Influence 6 (N=174)	Other (N=2)
			PERCENT					
Associate Pastor, Town and Country	15.00	31.58	20.83	26.09	37.93	28.07	40.23	50.00
Director of Religious Education	20.00	5.27	12.50	8.70	17.24	12.28	9.20	0.00
Pastor of a Coffee House	10.00	15.79	16.67	21.73	6.90	19.30	5.17	50.00
Prison Chaplain	5.00	10.53	8.33	0.00	6.90	1.75	4.02	0.00
Chaplain, Retirement Center	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.35	0.00	1.75	0.00	0.00
Foreign Missionary	15.00	0.00	12.50	13.04	17.24	10.53	27.01	0.00
Veterans' Chaplain	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.88	0.00
Director of Counseling	35.00	36.83	29.17	26.09	13.79	26.32	11.49	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 73.86542

DF = 49

P < .05

TABLE 3. (Questions 51 and 56)--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Influence of a Divine Call on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence 0 (N=17)	1 (N=20)	2 (N=24)	3 (N=22)	4 (N=29)	Most Influence 5 (N=57)	6 (N=173)	Other (N=3)
			PERCENT					
Assistant Pastor, Downtown Church	11.76	25.00	33.34	27.27	37.93	36.85	34.68	33.34
Executive, American Missions Board	5.89	10.00	0.00	9.09	0.00	3.51	0.58	0.00
Radio Pastor	5.89	0.00	8.33	0.00	3.45	5.26	9.25	0.00
Chaplain, School for the Deaf	0.00	5.00	0.00	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to an Ethnic Group	11.76	0.00	12.50	4.55	6.90	1.75	9.25	0.00
Pastor of an Inner City Church	23.53	5.00	12.50	18.18	17.24	19.30	30.64	33.33
Executive, Board of Stewardship	5.88	5.00	0.00	0.00	3.45	0.00	1.73	0.00
Pastor of a Counseling Center	35.29	50.00	33.33	36.36	31.03	33.33	13.87	33.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 76.87279

DF = 49

P < .01

TABLE 4. (Questions 39 and 56)--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Influence of a Wife, Girl Friend or Fiancee on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence					Most Influence		Other
	Least Influence 0 (N=162)	1 (N=38)	2 (N=33)	3 (N=35)	4 (N=35)	5 (N=22)	6 (N=13)	
			PERCENT					
Assistant Pastor, Downtown Church	31.48	26.32	15.15	40.00	37.14	54.54	38.46	0.00
Executive, American Missions Board	1.23	5.26	6.06	2.85	0.00	4.55	0.00	50.00
Radio Pastor	9.89	2.63	6.06	2.86	2.86	0.00	7.69	0.00
Chaplain, School for the Deaf	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.86	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to an Ethnic Group	6.17	10.53	6.06	2.86	11.43	4.55	23.08	16.66
Pastor of an Inner City Church	24.07	15.79	30.31	34.29	20.00	18.18	23.08	16.67
Executive, Board of Stewardship	1.23	5.26	6.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor of a Counseling Center	25.31	34.21	30.30	17.14	25.71	18.18	7.69	16.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 91.67302

DF = 49

P < .01

TABLE 5. (Questions 45 and 56)--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Influence of a Youth Group Leader on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							Other
	Least Influence 0 (N=204)	1 (N=45)	2 (N=28)	3 (N=29)	4 (N=19)	5 (N=11)	6 (N=4)	
			PERCENT					
Assistant Pastor, Downtown Church	32.84	35.56	28.57	10.34	36.84	18.18	50.00	25.00
Executive, American Missions Board	2.45	2.22	0.00	20.68	0.00	9.09	0.00	0.00
Radio Pastor	6.86	4.44	10.71	27.59	5.26	0.00	50.00	0.00
Chaplain, School for the Deaf	0.00	0.00	3.57	3.45	5.26	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to an Ethnic Group	8.33	8.90	3.57	27.59	10.53	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor of an Inner City Church	22.55	24.44	14.29	3.45	26.32	54.55	0.00	25.00
Executive, Board of Stewardship	1.97	4.44	0.00	3.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor of a Counseling Center	25.00	20.00	39.29	3.45	15.79	18.18	0.00	50.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 105.53593

DF = 49

P < .01

TABLE 6. (Questions 46 and 60)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Influence of a Church Councilman, Deacon or Trustee on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							Other
	Least Influence 0 (N=230)	1 (N=43)	2 (N=33)	3 (N=14)	4 (N=10)	5 (N=5)	Most Influence 6 (N=13)	
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	6.96	6.98	0.00	14.29	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00
Theological Education Exec.	12.17	20.93	12.12	21.43	10.00	0.00	0.00	20.00
Shopping Center Pastor	3.91	13.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Armed Services Chaplain	6.52	2.33	12.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	66.67	0.00
Assistant Pastor, Inner City	12.61	18.60	15.15	7.14	20.00	0.00	0.00	20.00
Denomination President	6.96	4.65	6.06	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Evangelist	7.39	11.63	15.15	7.14	30.00	0.00	0.00	60.00
Pastor, Suburban Church	43.48	20.93	39.40	50.00	30.00	80.00	33.33	0.00
Pastor, Suburban Church	35.55	15.87	24.00	28.57	40.00	20.00	67.62	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 79.18454$$

$$DF = 49$$

$$P < .01$$

TABLE 7. (Questions 51 and 60)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Influence of a Divine Call on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence 0 (N=18)	1 (N=18)	2 (N=25) PERCENT	3 (N=23)	4 (N=29)	Most Influence 5 (N=57)	6 (N=170)	Other (N=3)
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	5.56	11.11	8.00	0.00	17.24	5.26	5.29	0.00
Executive, Theological Education Board	22.22	38.87	8.00	21.73	10.34	12.28	10.00	33.34
Pastor to a Shopping Center	0.00	5.56	20.00	8.70	6.90	3.51	1.76	0.00
Chaplain in Armed Services	0.00	5.56	0.00	0.00	6.90	3.51	10.00	0.00
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	16.67	11.11	24.00	26.09	10.34	22.80	7.06	33.33
President of a Denomination	11.11	5.56	8.00	13.04	3.45	7.02	4.71	0.00
Evangelist	5.56	5.56	8.00	4.35	3.45	7.02	13.53	33.33
Pastor, Suburban Church	38.88	16.67	24.00	26.09	41.38	38.60	47.65	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 84.83688

DF = 49

P < .01

TABLE 8. (Questions 50 and 60)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Influence on Feeling of Duty on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence					Most Influence		Other
	0 (N=67)	1 (N=33)	2 (N=42)	3 (N=48)	4 (N=58)	5 (N=43)	6 (N=49)	(N=3)
			PERCENT					
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	10.45	3.03	9.52	0.00	5.17	11.63	4.08	0.00
Executive, Theological Education Board	10.45	27.28	9.52	10.42	13.80	13.95	12.24	33.34
Pastor to a Shopping Center	7.46	6.06	2.38	2.08	8.62	0.00	2.04	0.00
Chaplain in Armed Services	4.48	9.09	2.38	8.33	3.45	16.28	4.08	0.00
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	11.93	24.24	21.43	18.75	12.07	6.98	4.08	0.00
President of a Denomination	7.46	3.03	9.52	8.33	5.17	4.65	4.08	0.00
Evangelist	8.96	12.12	4.77	6.25	1.72	11.63	24.49	33.33
Pastor, Suburban Church	38.81	15.15	40.48	45.84	50.00	34.88	44.91	33.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 72.63152

DF = 49

P < .05

TABLE 9. (Questions 44 and 53)--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Influence of a Sunday School or Parochial School Teacher on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence					Most Influence		Other
	0 (N=178)	1 (N=42)	2 (N=40)	3 (N=37)	4 (N=19)	5 (N=17)	6 (N=7)	(N=5)
			PERCENT					
Administrator, Deaconess School	0.00	0.00	2.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Worker Priest	6.18	7.14	7.50	5.41	5.26	0.00	14.28	0.00
Assistant Pastor, Town & Country	12.36	4.76	12.50	13.51	26.32	17.64	14.29	0.00
Director, Youth Work	11.24	11.92	20.00	13.51	15.79	23.53	0.00	0.00
Executive, Board of Social Ministry	0.56	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Seminary Professor	2.81	4.76	7.50	2.70	0.00	0.00	14.29	40.00
Director, Community Organization	7.30	2.38	5.00	0.00	0.00	17.65	0.00	20.00
Pastor, Town and Country	59.55	69.04	40.00	64.87	52.63	41.18	57.14	40.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 67.02577

DF = 49

P < .05

TABLE 10. (Questions 51 and 53)--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Influence of a Divine Call on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							Other
	Least Influence 0 (N=18)	1 (N=18)	2 (N=23)	3 (N=22)	4 (N=30)	5 (N=56)	Most Influence 6 (N=175)	
Administrator, Deaconness School	0.00	0.00	PERCENT 0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.00
Worker Priest	5.56	5.56	13.04	18.18	6.66	10.71	1.71	33.34
Assistant Pastor, Town & Country	27.77	22.22	4.35	0.00	26.67	10.71	10.86	0.00
Director, Youth Work	5.56	22.22	8.70	27.27	13.33	21.43	9.14	0.00
Social Ministry Board Executive	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55	0.00	3.57	0.00	0.00
Seminary Professor	11.11	11.11	0.00	9.09	0.00	1.80	3.43	33.33
Director of Community Organization	22.22	5.56	21.74	0.00	6.67	3.57	3.43	0.00
Pastor, Town and Country Church	27.78	33.33	52.17	40.91	46.67	48.21	70.86	33.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 105.16766

DF = 49

P < .01

TABLE 11. (Questions 49 and 53)--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Influence of Concern for Community Problems on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence					Most Influence		Other
	0 (N=51)	1 (N=32)	2 (N=44)	3 (N=62)	4 (N=52)	5 (N=63)	6 (N=39)	(N=2)
			PERCENT					
Administrator, Deaconess School	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Worker Priest	0.00	0.00	4.55	3.23	11.54	4.77	20.51	0.00
Assistant Pastor, Town & Country	7.84	9.38	11.36	12.90	17.31	15.87	10.26	0.00
Director, Youth Work	7.84	15.63	13.64	11.29	9.62	20.63	12.82	0.00
Executive, Board of Social Ministry	0.00	3.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.17	0.00	0.00
Seminary Professor	5.89	6.25	4.55	1.61	1.91	4.77	2.56	99.00
Director of Community Organization	1.96	0.00	0.00	4.84	11.54	4.76	17.95	0.00
Pastor, Town and Country Church	76.47	65.61	65.90	64.52	48.08	46.03	35.90	1.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 74.22177

DF = 49

P < .05

TABLE 12. (Questions 50 and 57)--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Influence of Feeling of Duty on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence					Most Influence		Other
	0 (N=62)	1 (N=33)	2 (N=42)	3 (N=52)	4 (N=56)	5 (N=42)	6 (N=48)	(N=2)
	PERCENT							
Pastor to Night People	14.52	9.09	9.52	7.69	7.14	2.38	10.42	50.00
Executive, Board Youth Ministry	14.52	12.12	38.10	19.23	19.64	16.67	16.67	0.00
Chaplain of a Seamen's Home	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to a Leper Colony	1.61	6.06	0.00	3.85	0.00	2.38	4.17	0.00
Associate Pastor, Urban Church	43.55	21.21	26.19	51.92	33.93	42.86	45.83	0.00
Chaplain, Retarded Children's Home	1.61	12.12	0.00	0.00	5.36	2.38	2.08	0.00
Pastor to Seamen	1.61	3.03	2.38	3.85	0.00	0.00	2.08	0.00
Director of Religious Affairs, University	22.58	36.37	23.81	13.46	33.93	33.33	18.75	50.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 58.31616

DF = 42

P < .05

TABLE 13. (Questions 46 and 57)--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Influence of a Church Councilman, Deacon or Trustee on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence					Most Influence		Other
	0 (N=228)	1 (N=4)	2 (N=33)	3 (N=16)	4 (N=9)	5 (N=5)	6 (N=3)	(N=5)
			PERCENT					
Pastor to Night People	9.65	34.15	9.09	18.75	11.11	0.00	0.00	20.00
Executive, Board Youth Ministry	16.23	4.87	30.31	37.50	44.45	0.00	0.00	20.00
Chaplain of a Seamen's Home	0.00	2.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to a Leper Colony	2.63	0.00	3.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Associate Pastor, Urban Church	41.67	7.32	27.27	25.00	33.33	60.00	66.67	20.00
Chaplain, Retarded Children's Home	2.63	17.07	6.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to Seamen	2.19	4.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00
Director of Religious Affairs, University	25.00	29.27	24.24	18.75	11.11	20.00	33.33	40.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 87.39751

DF = 49

P < .01

TABLE 14. (Questions 40 and 57)--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Influence of a Brother on Decision to Enter Seminary

Type of Ministry	Extent of Influence							
	Least Influence					Most Influence		Other
	0 (N=161)	1 (N=28)	2 (N=19)	3 (N=11)	4 (N=4)	5 (N=5)	6 (N=5)	(N=104)
	PERCENT							
Pastor to Night People	8.07	3.57	21.05	0.00	0.00	20.00	20.00	10.58
Executive, Board Youth Ministry	19.90	10.71	10.53	18.18	0.00	0.00	40.00	23.08
Chaplain of a Seamen's Home	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.92
Pastor to a Leper Colony	3.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	35.58
Associate Pastor, Urban Church	43.49	42.87	31.58	9.09	50.00	40.00	0.00	1.92
Chaplain, Retarded Children's Home	3.11	10.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	1.92
Pastor to Seamen	2.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.04
Director of Religious Affairs, University	19.90	32.14	36.84	72.73	50.00	20.00	20.00	0.96
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 230.34125

DF = 56

P < .01

TABLE 15. (Questions 13 and 54)--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position

Type of Ministry	Doctrinal Position			
	Liberal (N=83)	Conservative (N=168)	Middle of the Road (N=89)	Other (N=8)
	PERCENT			
Associate Pastor, Town and Country	21.69	39.29	37.08	12.50
Director of Religious Education	12.05	10.12	11.24	12.50
Pastor of a Coffee House	27.71	2.97	6.74	37.50
Prison Chaplain	4.82	2.97	6.74	0.00
Chaplain, Retirement Center	0.00	0.60	1.12	0.00
Foreign Missionary	13.25	30.36	5.62	0.00
Veterans' Chaplain	0.00	2.38	1.12	0.00
Director of Counseling	20.48	11.31	30.34	37.50
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 86.04026

DF = 21

P < .01

TABLE 16. (Questions 13 and 56)--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position

Type of Ministry	Doctrinal Position			
	Liberal (N=83)	Conservative (N=148)	Middle of the Road (N=87)	Other (N=7)
	PERCENT			
Assistant Pastor, Downtown Church	31.33	37.82	34.48	28.57
Executive, American Missions Board	2.41	0.68	5.75	0.00
Radio Pastor	6.02	12.16	0.00	0.00
Chaplain, School for the Deaf	1.20	0.00	1.15	0.00
Pastor to an Ethnic Group	3.61	10.14	8.05	0.00
Pastor of an Inner City Church	15.66	22.30	13.79	57.14
Executive, Board of Stewardship	4.83	0.68	1.15	0.00
Pastor of a Counseling Center	34.94	16.22	35.63	14.29
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 52.22751

DF = 21

P < .01

TABLE 18. (Questions 27 and 56)--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry

Type of Ministry	Sureness of Ministry					
	Very Sure (N=175)	Somewhat Sure (N=96)	Undecided (N=38)	Somewhat Unsure (N=11)	Very Unsure (N=20)	Other (N=5)
	PERCENT					
Assistant Pastor, Downtown Church	35.43	32.29	34.21	45.46	15.00	0.00
Executive, American Missions Board	1.14	1.04	2.63	18.18	10.00	0.00
Radio Pastor	6.29	5.21	13.16	9.09	5.00	0.00
Chaplain of a School for Deaf	0.00	0.00	2.63	0.00	5.00	0.00
Pastor to an Ethnic Group	8.57	5.21	7.90	0.00	10.00	0.00
Pastor of an Inner City Church	29.71	17.70	18.42	0.00	20.00	40.00
Executive, Board of Stewardship	0.57	3.13	0.00	0.00	5.00	20.00
Pastor of a Counseling Center	18.29	35.42	21.05	27.27	30.00	40.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 60.71535

DF = 35

P < .01

TABLE 19. (Questions 12 and 54)--Ministry Desired When Training Completed, According to Political Preference

Type of Ministry	Political Preference					
	Liberal Democrat (N=78)	Conservative Democrat (N=19)	Liberal Republican (N=59)	Conservative Republican (N=116)	Independent (N=46)	Miscellaneous (N=30)
	PERCENT					
Associate Pastor, Town and Country	20.51	52.63	37.29	36.21	39.13	33.33
Director of Religious Education	12.82	5.26	13.56	9.48	10.87	10.00
Pastor of a Coffee House	24.36	10.53	3.39	2.59	13.04	16.67
Prison Chaplain	6.41	0.00	5.08	3.45	4.35	3.33
Chaplain, Retirement Center	0.00	0.00	1.69	0.86	0.00	0.00
Foreign Missionary	12.82	10.53	6.79	34.48	13.04	16.67
Veterans' Chaplain	1.28	0.00	0.00	2.59	0.00	3.33
Director of Counseling	21.80	21.05	32.20	10.34	19.57	16.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 74.03967

DF = 35

P < .01

TABLE 20. (Questions 2 and 58)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Class in Seminary

Type of Ministry	Class in Seminary			
	First Year (N=131)	Second Year (N=111)	Third Year (N=58)	Fourth Year (N=46)
	PERCENT			
Associate Pastor, Suburban Church	25.19	20.72	24.14	23.91
Instructor in a Seminary	26.72	32.43	31.03	19.57
Pastor to Jazz Artists	1.53	1.80	1.73	6.52
Pastor, Prisoners' Halfway House	4.58	5.40	3.44	8.70
Executive, Board Church Vocations	3.81	1.80	5.17	4.35
Pastor, Narcotics' Halfway House	3.82	4.50	1.73	13.04
Assistant Pastor, Urban Church	2.29	9.93	15.52	6.52
College Chaplain	32.06	23.42	17.24	17.39
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 33.42259

DF = 21

P < .05

TABLE 21. (Questions 2 and 60)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Class in Seminary

Type of Ministry	Class in Seminary			
	1 (N=131)	2 (N=111)	3 (N=58)	4 (N=44)
		PERCENT		
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	6.12	0.91	8.62	9.09
Executive, Theological Education Board	11.45	4.50	8.62	9.09
Pastor to a Shopping Center	3.05	19.82	3.44	15.90
Chaplain in Armed Services	6.87	1.80	5.17	0.00
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	11.45	9.01	20.71	13.64
President of a Denomination	7.63	11.71	1.72	13.64
Evangelist	11.45	3.60	10.34	4.55
Pastor, Suburban Church	41.98	9.91	41.38	34.09
No Response		38.74		
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 166.44495

DF = 24

P < .01

TABLE 22. (Questions 13 and 58)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position

Type of Ministry	Doctrinal Position			
	Liberal (N=82)	Conservative (N=168)	Middle of the Road (N=88)	Other (N=8)
	PERCENT			
Associate Pastor, Suburban Church	8.54	27.38	30.68	12.50
Instructor in a Seminary	24.39	36.31	19.32	0.00
Pastor to Jazz Artists	7.32	0.60	1.14	0.00
Pastor, Prisoners' Halfway House	4.87	5.36	5.68	0.00
Executive, Board Church Vocations	2.44	2.98	4.54	12.50
Pastor, Narcotics' Halfway House	4.88	2.97	6.82	25.00
Assistant Pastor, Urban Church	8.54	5.95	10.23	0.00
College Chaplain	39.02	18.45	21.59	50.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 58.53277

DF = 21

P < .01

TABLE 23. (Questions 13 and 60)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position

Type of Ministry	Doctrinal Position			
	Liberal (N=81)	Conservative (N=167)	Middle of the Road (N=87)	Other (N=8)
	PERCENT			
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	6.17	5.39	6.90	25.00
Executive, Theological Education Board	20.99	7.78	16.09	25.00
Pastor to a Shopping Center	9.88	0.00	8.05	0.00
Chaplain in Armed Services	2.47	10.18	2.30	12.50
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	24.69	7.19	13.78	25.00
President of a Denomination	11.11	4.19	5.75	0.00
Evangelist	1.23	15.57	8.05	0.00
Pastor, Suburban Church	23.46	49.70	39.08	12.50
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 79.56043

DF = 21

P < .01

TABLE 24. (Questions 27 and 60)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry

Type of Ministry	Sureness of Ministry					
	Very Sure (N=177)	Somewhat Sure (N=93)	Undecided (N=36)	Somewhat Unsure (N=11)	Very Unsure (N=21)	Other (N=5)
	PERCENT					
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	3.95	11.83	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
Executive, Theological Education Board	10.17	13.98	19.44	9.09	23.82	40.00
Pastor to a Shopping Center	0.56	8.60	5.56	18.18	4.76	20.00
Chaplain in Armed Services	6.21	6.45	11.11	0.00	4.76	0.00
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	10.73	13.98	16.67	0.00	33.33	20.00
President of a Denomination	4.52	6.45	11.11	9.09	4.76	20.00
Evangelist	11.86	9.68	8.33	9.09	0.00	0.00
Pastor, Suburban Church	52.00	29.03	16.67	54.55	28.57	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 69.96635

DF = 35

P < .01

TABLE 25. (Questions 36 and 60)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Undergraduate Major

Type of Ministry	Undergraduate Major					
	Liberal Arts & Humanities (N=201)	Social Science (N=95)	Applied Science (N=8)	Business & Accounting (N=16)	Natural Science (N=14)	Other (N=9)
	PERCENT					
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	6.99	6.32	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00
Executive, Theological Education Board	10.45	18.93	0.00	12.50	21.43	22.22
Pastor to a Shopping Center	3.88	7.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Chaplain in Armed Services	7.99	1.05	12.50	18.75	0.00	11.11
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	10.98	20.00	25.00	0.00	14.29	11.11
President of a Denomination	4.98	11.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Evangelist	12.44	4.21	12.50	6.25	21.43	0.00
Pastor, Suburban Church	42.29	30.53	50.00	50.00	42.85	55.56
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 87.86869

DF = 56

P < .01

TABLE 26. (Questions 12 and 58)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Political Preference

Type of Ministry	Political Preference					
	Liberal Democrat (N=76)	Conservative Democrat (N=18)	Liberal Republican (N=59)	Conservative Republican (N=118)	Independent (N=48)	Miscellaneous (N=27)
	PERCENT					
Associate Pastor, Suburban Church	11.84	27.78	18.64	30.50	29.17	22.22
Instructor in a Seminary	26.32	22.22	20.34	39.00	16.66	29.63
Pastor to Jazz Artists	3.95	0.00	3.39	0.85	4.17	0.00
Pastor, Prisoners' Halfway House	6.58	16.67	3.39	3.39	4.17	7.41
Executive, Board Church Vocations	2.63	0.00	6.79	2.54	4.17	3.70
Pastor, Narcotics' Halfway House	7.89	0.00	8.47	3.39	0.00	7.41
Assistant Pastor, Urban Church	6.58	11.11	15.25	5.08	8.33	0.00
College Chaplain	34.21	22.22	23.73	15.25	33.33	29.63
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 54.25760

DF = 35

P < .05

TABLE 27. (Questions 12 and 60)--Ministry Desired Ten Years After Completion of Seminary Training,
According to Political Preference

Type of Ministry	Political Preference					
	Liberal Democrat (N=78)	Conservative Democrat (N=19)	Liberal Republican (N=58)	Conservative Republican (N=116)	Independent (N=45)	Other (N=27)
	PERCENT					
Assistant Pastor, Suburban Church	11.54	5.26	1.72	6.89	2.22	7.41
Executive, Theological Education Board	20.51	5.26	13.80	7.76	13.33	22.22
Pastor to a Shopping Center	10.26	0.00	8.62	0.86	2.22	0.00
Chaplain in Armed Services	2.56	5.26	1.72	12.07	4.44	7.41
Assistant Pastor, Inner City Church	24.36	26.32	13.80	3.45	11.11	18.52
President of a Denomination	6.41	10.53	10.34	2.59	8.91	3.70
Evangelist	2.56	5.26	8.62	15.52	13.33	7.41
Pastor, Suburban Church	21.80	42.11	41.38	50.86	44.44	33.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 82.72185

DF = 35

P < .01

TABLE 28. (Questions 13 and 53)--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position

Type of Ministry	Doctrinal Position			
	Liberal (N=81)	Conservative (N=168)	Middle of the Road (N=88)	Other (N=8)
	PERCENT			
Administrator, Deaconness School	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.00
Worker Priest	18.52	0.60	5.67	0.00
Assistant Pastor, Town and Country	16.05	7.14	17.05	37.50
Director of Youth Work	19.75	10.71	9.09	37.50
Executive, Board of Social Ministry	1.23	0.00	2.27	0.00
Professor in a Seminary	8.64	3.57	1.14	0.00
Director for Community Organization	12.35	2.98	4.55	12.50
Pastor, Town and Country	23.46	74.40	60.23	12.50
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 96.36705

DF = 21

P < .01

TABLE 29. (Questions 13 and 55)--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Doctrinal Position

Type of Ministry	Doctrinal Position			
	Liberal (N=74)	Conservative (N=155)	Middle of the Road (N=84)	Other (N=7)
	PERCENT			
Industrial Chaplain	21.62	6.45	7.14	14.29
Pastor to a Racial Group	29.73	22.58	21.43	71.42
Pastor to High-Rise Apartments	17.57	22.58	23.81	14.29
Chaplain, School for the Blind	2.70	5.16	2.38	0.00
Hospital Chaplain	22.98	24.52	30.96	0.00
Bishop	1.35	8.39	4.76	0.00
Executive, Board of Evangelism	0.00	5.16	5.95	0.00
Executive, Board of World Missions	4.05	5.16	3.57	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 35.73698

DF = 21

P < .05

TABLE 30. (Questions 27 and 53)--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry

Type of Ministry	Sureness of Ministry					
	Very Sure (N=174)	Somewhat Sure (N=95)	Undecided (N=38)	Somewhat Unsure (N=12)	Very Unsure (N=21)	Other (N=5)
		PERCENT				
Administrator, Deaconess School	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Worker Priest	1.72	8.42	7.90	16.68	14.29	40.00
Assistant Pastor, Town and Country	11.49	12.63	15.79	25.00	9.52	0.00
Director of Youth Work	12.64	12.63	21.05	0.00	14.29	0.00
Executive, Board of Social Ministry	0.57	0.00	0.00	8.33	4.76	0.00
Professor in a Seminary	2.89	3.16	2.63	8.33	14.29	20.00
Director for Community Organization	2.30	6.32	18.42	8.33	9.52	0.00
Pastor, Town and Country	67.82	56.84	34.21	33.33	33.33	40.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 76.52083

DF = 35

P < .01

TABLE 31. (Questions 12 and 53)--Ministry Sure of When Training Completed, According to Political Preference

Type of Ministry	Political Preference					
	Liberal Democrat (N=75)	Conservative Democrat (N=18)	Liberal Republican (N=60)	Conservative Republican (N=117)	Independent (N=46)	Miscellaneous (N=29)
	PERCENT					
Administrator, Deaconness School	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.00
Worker Priest	17.33	0.00	1.67	0.86	8.70	6.91
Assistant Pastor, Town and Country	17.33	22.22	16.67	8.55	10.86	3.45
Director of Youth Work	17.33	0.00	8.33	11.11	19.57	17.24
Executive, Board of Social Ministry	0.00	5.56	0.00	0.00	4.35	0.00
Professor in a Seminary	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.27	6.52	10.34
Director for Community Organization	10.68	0.00	10.00	0.85	4.35	10.34
Pastor, Town and Country	33.33	72.22	63.33	73.50	45.65	51.72
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 87.29063

DF = 35

P < .01

TABLE 32. (Questions 7 and 59)--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Birth Order

Type of Ministry	Number of Children Born Previously						
	0 (N=144)	1 (N=84)	2 (N=53)	3 (N=17)	4 (N=18)	5 (N=7)	6 and Over (N=15)
			PERCENT				
Television Pastor	2.08	2.38	5.66	17.65	5.55	0.00	0.00
Downtown Church Pastor	53.48	61.91	56.60	11.76	72.22	85.71	66.66
Race Track Pastor	1.39	3.57	1.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Children's Home Chaplain	17.36	15.48	16.99	5.89	5.56	14.29	6.67
Executive Parish Education Board	9.03	7.14	5.66	5.89	11.11	0.00	20.00
Administrator, Council of Churches	4.86	0.00	0.00	11.76	0.00	0.00	0.00
Executive, Press Radio, Television	6.94	2.38	3.77	11.76	0.00	0.00	6.67
Executive, Inter-church Relations	4.86	7.14	9.43	35.29	5.56	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 70.30133$$

$$DF = 42$$

$$P < .01$$

TABLE 33. (Questions 27 and 57)--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry

Type of Ministry	Sureness of Ministry					
	Very Sure (N=167)	Somewhat Sure (N=96)	Undecided (N=37)	Somewhat Unsure (N=11)	Very Unsure (N=21)	Other (N=5)
	PERCENT					
Pastor to Night People	5.98	12.50	8.11	27.27	9.52	20.00
Executive, Board Youth Ministry	20.36	17.71	21.62	9.09	19.05	20.00
Chaplain of a Seamen's Home	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to a Leper Colony	2.40	2.08	0.00	0.00	9.52	0.00
Associate Pastor, Urban Church	47.31	41.67	18.92	27.27	9.52	0.00
Chaplain, Mentally Retarded Children's Home	1.20	4.17	5.41	0.00	9.52	0.00
Pastor to Seamen	3.59	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Director of Religious Affairs, University	19.16	21.87	45.94	36.37	42.87	60.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 55.36177

DF = 30

P < .01

TABLE 34. (Questions 27 and 59)---Ministry Sure of Having Ten Years After Seminary Training Completed, According to Sureness of Ministry

Type of Ministry	Sureness of Ministry					
	Very Sure (N=177)	Somewhat Sure (N=93)	Undecided (N=37)	Somewhat Unsure (N=12)	Very Unsure (N=19)	Other (N=5)
		PERCENT				
Television Pastor	30.51	2.15	2.70	0.00	0.00	0.00
Downtown Church Pastor	26.00	58.06	35.14	50.00	36.83	20.00
Race Track Pastor	1.69	1.08	0.00	0.00	10.53	0.00
Children's Home Chaplain	5.08	17.20	18.91	25.00	26.32	20.00
Executive, Parish Education Board	3.39	9.68	18.92	0.00	10.53	20.00
Administrator, Council of Churches	2.82	2.15	5.41	0.00	0.00	20.00
Executive, Board of Press, Radio, Television	10.17	1.08	16.22	8.33	5.26	0.00
Executive, Interchurch Relations	20.34	8.60	2.70	16.67	10.53	20.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 126.97906

DF = 35

P < .01

TABLE 35. (Questions 36 and 57)--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Undergraduate Major

Type of Ministry	Liberal Arts & Humanities (N=200)	Undergraduate Social Science (N=98)	Major Applied Science (N=1)	Business & Accounting (N=13)	Natural Science (N=15)	Other (N=9)
	PERCENT					
Pastor to Night People	31.00	8.16	0.00	7.69	6.66	11.11
Executive, Board Youth Ministry	1.50	21.43	25.00	23.08	6.67	11.11
Chaplain of a Seamen's Home	10.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pastor to a Leper Colony	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	0.00
Associate Pastor, Urban Church	7.50	36.74	37.50	46.15	26.67	33.34
Chaplain, Retarded Children's Home	28.00	3.06	0.00	0.00	13.33	0.00
Pastor to Seamen	1.00	1.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.11
Director of Religious Affairs, University	19.50	29.59	37.50	23.08	40.00	33.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square. = 154.98354

DF = 56

P < .01

TABLE 36. (Questions 36 and 59)--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Undergraduate Major

Type of Ministry	Liberal Arts & Humanities (N=197)	Undergraduate Major			Business & Accounting (N=14)	Natural Science (N=14)	Other (N=8)
		Social Science (N=97)	Applied Science (N=8)	PERCENT			
Television Pastor	3.55	55.68	75.00		42.87	57.14	62.50
Downtown Church Pastor	61.42	2.06	0.00		0.00	0.00	12.50
Race Track Pastor	1.52	13.40	12.50		28.57	28.58	12.50
Children's Home Chaplain	14.21	11.34	0.00		7.14	7.14	12.50
Executive, Parish Education Board	7.62	5.15	0.00		7.14	0.00	0.00
Administrator, Council of Churches	1.02	5.15	12.50		7.14	0.00	0.00
Executive, Board of Press, Radio, Television	4.06	6.19	0.00		0.00	7.14	0.00
Executive, Board of Interchurch Relations	6.60	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00
No Response		1.03			7.14		
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00		100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 229.60356

DF = 64

P < .01

TABLE 37. (Questions 12 and 59)--Ministry Sure of Ten Years After Training Completed, According to Political Preference

Type of Ministry	Political Preference					
	Liberal Democrat (N=76)	Conservative Democrat (N=18)	Liberal Republican (N=59)	Conservative Republican (N=116)	Independent (N=44)	Miscellaneous (N=25)
	PERCENT					
Television Pastor	1.32	5.56	1.69	3.45	4.55	0.00
Downtown Church Pastor	46.05	77.76	62.71	68.96	45.45	56.00
Race Track Pastor	3.93	5.56	1.69	0.00	0.00	4.00
Children's Home Chaplain	19.74	5.56	10.17	14.66	15.90	20.00
Executive, Parish Education Board	10.53	0.00	5.08	6.03	22.73	4.00
Administrator, Council of Churches	6.58	0.00	1.69	0.86	2.27	0.00
Executive, Board of Press, Radio, Television	1.32	5.56	10.17	3.45	4.55	4.00
Executive, Board of Interchurch Relations	10.53	0.00	6.80	2.59	4.55	12.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 56.59439

DF = 35

P < .05

TABLE 38. (Questions 2 and 49)--Influence of Concern for Social and Community Problems on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Class in Seminary

Extent of Influence		Class in Seminary			
		First Year (N=140)	Second Year (N=115)	Third Year (N=59)	Fourth Year (N=48)
		PERCENT			
Least Influence	0	17.85	11.30	28.81	6.25
	1	10.00	13.92	3.39	6.25
	2	12.86	11.30	18.64	6.25
	3	12.86	15.66	23.73	29.17
	4	17.86	11.30	8.47	20.83
	5	16.43	24.35	10.17	16.67
Most Influence	6	12.14	12.17	6.79	14.58
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 37.38643

DF = 18

P < .01

TABLE 39. (Questions 2 and 51)--Influence of a Divine Call on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Class in Seminary

Extent of Influence	Class in Seminary			
	First Year (N=140)	Second Year (N=115)	Third Year (N=58)	Fourth Year (N=48)
	PERCENT			
Least Influence 0	6.43	3.48	6.91	8.33
1	4.28	6.97	0.00	12.50
2	8.57	5.22	3.44	10.42
3	6.43	7.83	0.00	10.42
4	7.86	6.07	10.34	12.50
5	12.86	14.78	22.41	20.83
Most Influence 6	53.57	55.65	56.90	25.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 30.83661

DF = 18

P < .05

TABLE 40. (Questions 7 and 40)--Influence of Brother on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Birth Order

Extent of Influence		Number of Children Born Before Self						
		0 (N=97)	1 (N=56)	2 (N=41)	3 (N=15)	4 (N=19)	5 (N=8)	6 and Over (N=15)
PERCENT								
Least Influence	0	82.48	64.29	63.41	66.66	47.37	50.00	66.67
	1	11.34	14.29	12.20	0.00	21.05	12.50	0.00
	2	5.15	8.92	7.32	20.00	10.53	12.50	6.66
	3	1.03	10.71	4.87	0.00	10.53	0.00	6.67
	4	0.00	0.00	2.44	0.00	0.00	12.50	20.00
	5	0.00	1.79	2.44	6.67	5.26	12.50	0.00
Most Influence	6	0.00	0.00	7.32	6.67	5.26	0.00	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 77.60052

DF = 36

P < .01

TABLE 41. (Questions 8 and 39)--Influence of a Wife, Girl Friend, or Fiancee on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Size of Place

Extent of Influence		Farm or Open Country (N=83)	Village or Small Town (N=42)	Size of Place		25,000-49,999 (N=27)	50,000-99,999 (N=29)	100,000-499,999 (N=36)	500,000 Over (N=79)	Other (N=3)
				2,500-9,999 (N=39)	10,000-24,999 (N=27)					
PERCENT										
Least Influence	0	30.12	38.09	48.71	51.86	48.15	58.62	41.66	64.56	0.00
	1	12.05	9.52	12.83	14.81	14.81	6.89	16.67	5.06	33.34
	2	4.82	16.68	5.13	3.70	14.81	6.90	19.44	8.86	33.33
	3	12.05	16.67	5.13	7.41	7.41	0.00	8.33	10.13	33.33
	4	15.66	9.52	15.38	7.41	7.41	17.24	2.78	5.06	0.00
	5	8.43	7.14	10.26	11.11	7.41	6.90	5.56	1.27	0.00
Most Influence	6	16.87	2.38	2.56	3.70	0.00	3.45	5.56	5.06	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 74.83119

DF = 48

P < .01

TABLE 42. (Questions 8 and 41)--Father's Influence on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Size of Place

Extent of Influence		Farm or Open Country (N=76)	Village or Small Town (N=42)	Size of Place						Other (N=4)
				2,500- 9,999 (N=40)	10,000- 24,999 (N=27)	25,000- 49,999 (N=27)	50,000- 99,999 (N=30)	100,000- 499,999 (N=36)	500,000- Over (N=80)	
PERCENT										
Least Influence	0	36.84	38.09	27.50	37.04	48.15	30.00	41.67	43.75	25.00
	1	13.16	14.29	10.00	25.93	11.11	6.67	19.44	11.25	0.00
	2	21.05	11.90	22.50	22.22	11.11	13.33	13.88	11.25	0.00
	3	11.85	9.52	12.50	11.11	25.93	10.00	5.56	18.75	25.00
	4	5.26	7.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	13.89	7.50	25.00
	5	6.58	7.14	17.50	0.00	0.00	6.67	2.78	6.25	0.00
Most Influence	6	5.26	11.92	10.00	3.70	3.70	13.33	2.78	1.25	25.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 67.22931

DF = 48

P < .05

TABLE 43. (Questions 8 and 49)--Influence of Concern for Social and Community Problems on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Size of Place

Extent of Influence		Farm or Open Country (N=75)	Village or Small Town (N=42)	Size of Place		25,000- 49,999 (N=27)	50,000- 99,999 (N=30)	100,000- 499,999 (N=36)	500,000- Over (N=80)	Other (N=5)
				2,500- 9,999 (N=40)	10,000- 24,999 (N=27)					
PERCENT										
Least Influence	0	17.33	21.43	12.50	18.57	25.94	10.00	19.44	11.25	0.00
	1	6.68	9.52	12.50	14.99	11.11	6.66	8.33	11.25	80.00
	2	21.33	7.14	15.00	11.11	14.81	20.00	11.11	3.75	20.00
	3	21.33	26.19	17.50	3.48	14.81	16.67	13.90	13.75	0.00
	4	20.00	23.82	5.00	22.22	11.11	6.67	16.67	10.00	0.00
	5	8.00	7.14	25.00	22.22	14.81	16.67	19.44	30.00	0.00
Most Influence	6	5.33	4.76	12.50	7.41	7.41	23.33	11.11	20.00	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 91.44687

DF = 48

P < .01

TABLE 44. (Questions 13 and 39)---Influence of a Wife, Girl Friend or Fiancee on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Doctrinal Position

Extent of Influence		Doctrinal Position			
		Liberal (N=85)	Conservative (N=176)	Middle of the Road (N=88)	Other (N=8)
		PERCENT			
Least Influence	0	62.35	42.61	44.32	62.50
	1	15.29	7.95	12.50	25.00
	2	10.59	8.52	12.50	0.00
	3	4.71	11.36	12.50	0.00
	4	2.35	15.92	6.82	12.50
	5	3.53	7.39	9.09	0.00
Most Influence	6	1.18	6.25	2.27	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 32.84521

DF = 18

P < .01

TABLE 45. (Questions 13 and 41)--Influence of Father on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Doctrinal Position

Extent of Influence		Doctrinal Position			
		Liberal (N=87)	Conservative (N=178)	Middle of the Road (N=90)	Other (N=8)
PERCENT					
Least Influence	0	41.38	41.01	31.11	25.00
	1	9.20	11.78	21.10	0.00
	2	20.69	11.80	16.66	37.50
	3	10.34	12.38	16.68	37.50
	4	11.49	5.62	5.56	0.00
	5	5.75	7.30	5.56	0.00
Most Influence	6	1.15	10.11	3.33	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 36.78428

DF = 18

P < .01

TABLE 46. (Questions 13 and 42)--Influence of a Mother on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Doctrinal Position

Extent of Influence	Doctrinal Position			
	Liberal (N=87)	Conservative (N=178)	Middle of the Road (N=90)	Other (N=8)
	PERCENT			
Least Influence 0	28.74	31.46	20.00	37.50
1	13.79	10.11	23.33	12.50
2	19.54	15.17	17.78	12.50
3	17.24	15.73	18.89	0.00
4	13.79	10.67	15.56	25.00
5	6.90	8.43	4.44	12.50
Most Influence 6	0.00	8.43	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 41.82835

DF = 18

P < .01

TABLE 47. (Questions 13 and 47)--Influence of a Boy Scout Leader on Decision to Enter Seminary,
According to Doctrinal Postion

Extent of Influence		Doctrinal Position			
		Liberal (N=86)	Conservative (N=173)	Middle of the Road (N=89)	Other (N=7)
		PERCENT			
Least Influence	0	86.05	95.96	92.13	85.71
	1	8.14	1.73	1.12	0.00
	2	3.48	2.31	3.38	14.29
	3	2.33	0.00	3.37	0.00
	4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Most Influence	6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 25.07809

DF = 9

P < .01

TABLE 48. (Questions 13 and 48)--Influence of Desire to Help People on Decision to Enter Seminary,
According to Doctrinal Position

Extent of Influence		Doctrinal Position			
		Liberal (N=87)	Conservative (N=177)	Middle of the Road (N=91)	Other (N=7)
PERCENT					
Least Influence	0	0.00	8.47	1.10	0.00
	1	1.15	2.26	1.10	0.00
	2	5.75	5.08	10.99	0.00
	3	12.64	9.60	6.59	0.00
	4	16.09	14.70	18.68	14.29
	5	28.74	22.60	39.56	28.57
Most Influence	6	35.63	37.29	21.98	57.14
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 32.11919

DF = 18

P < .05

TABLE 49. (Questions 13 and 49)--Influence of Concern for Social and Community Problems on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Doctrinal Position

Extent of Influence		Doctrinal Position			
		Liberal (N=87)	Conservative (N=178)	Middle of the Road (N=89)	Other (N=8)
		PERCENT			
Least Influence	0	3.45	29.21	2.25	12.50
	1	5.75	12.36	8.98	0.00
	2	6.90	17.98	7.87	0.00
	3	11.49	17.42	24.72	12.50
	4	16.09	8.99	23.60	25.00
	5	31.03	7.30	23.60	50.00
Most Influence	6	25.29	6.74	8.98	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 108.34995

DF = 18

P < .01

TABLE 50. (Questions 13 and 50)--Influence of Duty on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Doctrinal Position

Extent of Influence		Doctrinal Position			
		Liberal (N=87)	Conservative (N=177)	Middle of the Road (N=89)	Other (N=8)
PERCENT					
Least Influence	0	26.44	19.21	14.61	50.00
	1	13.80	6.79	11.24	0.00
	2	13.79	10.73	12.36	12.50
	3	17.24	12.43	17.97	0.00
	4	11.49	15.25	21.35	37.50
	5	11.49	12.43	12.36	0.00
Most Influence	6	5.75	23.16	10.11	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 35.12792

DF = 18

P < .01

TABLE 51. (Questions 13 and 51)--Influence of Divine Call on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Doctrinal Position

Extent of Influence		Doctrinal Position			
		Liberal (N=86)	Conservative (N=178)	Middle of the Road (N=89)	Other (N=8)
		PERCENT			
Least Influence	0	10.47	1.12	8.99	25.00
	1	13.95	1.12	6.74	0.00
	2	16.28	2.25	7.87	0.00
	3	17.44	1.12	6.74	0.00
	4	11.63	3.94	13.48	12.50
	5	12.79	10.67	29.21	25.00
Most Influence	6	17.44	79.78	26.97	37.50
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 128.20851

DF = 18

P < .01

TABLE 52. (Questions 20 and 41)--Father's Influence on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Father's Education

Extent of Influence		Father's Education							
		Under 8 Grades (N=37)	8th Grade (N=52)	9th-11th Grade (N=42)	High School (N=80)	Some College (N=66)	College Graduate (N=30)	Post- Graduate (N=48)	Other (N=8)
PERCENT									
Least Influence	0	54.05	53.85	38.10	41.25	22.73	46.67	16.67	62.50
	1	16.22	15.38	9.52	10.00	18.18	10.00	12.50	12.50
	2	10.80	9.62	26.19	16.25	21.21	16.67	10.42	0.00
	3	5.41	15.38	14.29	15.00	19.70	10.00	10.42	0.00
	4	5.41	5.77	7.14	7.50	9.09	3.33	6.25	12.50
	5	5.41	0.00	0.00	8.75	3.03	10.00	16.66	12.50
Most Influence	6	2.70	0.00	4.76	1.25	6.06	3.33	27.08	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 100.68938

DF = 48

P < .01

TABLE 53. (Questions 21 and 41)--Father's Influence on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Mother's Education

Extent of Influence		Under 8 Grades (N=21)	8th Grade (N=47)	9th-11th Grade (N=53)	High School (N=123)	Some College (N=76)	College Graduate (N=29)	Post- Graduate (N=9)	Other (N=5)
		PERCENT							
Least Influence	0	52.38	48.94	41.51	33.33	39.47	31.03	0.00	60.00
	1	14.29	17.02	13.21	16.26	6.58	10.34	11.11	20.00
	2	19.05	8.51	16.97	17.07	18.42	17.24	0.00	0.00
	3	4.76	12.76	13.21	14.63	13.16	10.34	44.45	0.00
	4	4.76	4.26	11.32	7.32	7.90	3.45	0.00	0.00
	5	0.00	8.51	1.89	4.89	5.26	20.69	11.11	20.00
Most Influence	6	4.76	0.00	1.89	6.50	9.21	6.91	33.33	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 65.76602

DF = 48

P < .05

TABLE 54. (Questions 26 and 41)---Father's Influence on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Age of Decision to Study for the Ministry

Extent of Influence		Age of Decision						Other (N=9)
		Under 10 (N=9)	Between 10 & 13 (N=24)	During High School (N=82)	During College (N=174)	After College (N=56)	After High School (N=9)	
PERCENT								
Least Influence	0	11.11	16.67	36.59	37.93	46.43	66.67	66.67
	1	0.00	8.33	12.20	15.52	8.92	33.33	11.11
	2	0.00	4.17	18.29	14.94	25.00	0.00	11.11
	3	11.11	37.50	10.96	14.94	5.36	0.00	11.11
	4	22.22	16.66	4.88	4.60	12.50	0.00	0.00
	5	11.11	12.50	6.10	8.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
Most Influence	6	44.45	4.17	10.98	4.02	1.79	0.00	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 87.81633

DF = 42

P < .01

TABLE 55. (Questions 26 and 42)--Mother's Influence on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Age of Decision to Study for the Ministry

Extent of Influence		Under 10 (N=9)	Between 10 & 13 (N=24)	During High School (N=82)	During College (N=174)	After College (N=56)	After High School (N=9)	Other (N=9)
		PERCENT						
Least Influence	0	11.11	4.17	24.39	24.71	42.86	66.67	77.78
	1	0.00	4.17	8.54	18.39	16.07	22.22	11.11
	2	0.00	8.33	24.39	16.09	16.07	11.11	11.11
	3	22.22	20.83	14.63	19.54	12.50	0.00	0.00
	4	11.11	41.67	10.98	11.49	12.50	0.00	0.00
	5	22.22	12.50	13.41	5.76	0.00	0.00	0.00
Most Influence	6	33.34	8.33	3.66	4.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 97.53979

DF = 42

P < .01

TABLE 56. (Questions 26 and 49)--Influence of Concern for Social and Community Problems on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Age of Decision to Study for the Ministry

Extent of Influence		Age of Decision						
		Under 10 (N=9)	Between 10 & 13 (N=24)	During High School (N=81)	During College (N=175)	After College (N=55)	After High School (N=9)	Other (N=9)
PERCENT								
Least Influence	0	22.22	4.17	18.52	14.29	23.64	22.22	0.00
	1	0.00	29.17	4.94	10.29	1.82	44.45	11.11
	2	22.22	8.33	17.28	13.14	5.45	11.11	0.00
	3	33.34	12.50	20.99	16.57	20.00	11.11	0.00
	4	11.11	16.66	9.88	13.71	18.18	11.11	55.56
	5	0.00	16.67	20.98	18.86	16.36	0.00	22.22
Most Influence	6	11.11	12.50	7.41	13.14	14.55	0.00	11.11
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 65.08154

DF = 42

P < .05

TABLE 57. (Questions 27 and 39)--Influence of a Wife, Girl Friend or Fiancee on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Sureness of Ministry as Life Work

Extent of Influence		Sureness of Ministry					Other (N=5)
		Very Sure (N=183)	Somewhat Sure (N=97)	Undecided (N=39)	Somewhat Unsure (N=11)	Very Unsure (N=0)	
PERCENT							
Least Influence	0	48.09	47.42	58.97	27.27	0.00	80.00
	1	8.74	17.53	2.56	0.00	0.00	20.00
	2	7.65	6.19	17.95	45.46	0.00	0.00
	3	9.84	13.40	5.13	0.00	0.00	0.00
	4	12.02	8.25	10.26	18.18	0.00	0.00
	5	7.65	5.15	5.13	9.09	0.00	0.00
Most Influence	6	6.01	2.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	000.00	100.00

Chi-square = 43.95906

DF = 30

P < .05

TABLE 58. (Questions 27 and 47)--Influence of a Boy Scout Leader on Decision to Enter Seminary,
According to Sureness of Ministry as Life Work

Extent of Influence		Sureness of Ministry					
		Very Sure (N=183)	Somewhat Sure (N=95)	Undecided (N=40)	Somewhat Unsure (N=12)	Very Unsure (N=22)	Other (N=4)
PERCENT							
Least Influence	0	93.44	91.57	92.50	91.67	68.18	75.00
	1	2.73	2.11	2.50	0.00	13.64	25.00
	2	3.28	3.16	5.00	0.00	9.09	0.00
	3	0.55	3.16	0.00	8.33	9.09	0.00
	4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Most Influence	6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 29.30272

DF = 15

P < .05

TABLE 59. (Questions 27 and 48)--Influence of Desire to Help People on Decision to Enter Seminary,
According to Sureness of Ministry as Life Work

Extent of Influence		Sureness of Ministry					
		Very Sure (N=185)	Somewhat Sure (N=98)	Undecided (N=41)	Somewhat Unsure (N=12)	Very Unsure (N=22)	Other (N=4)
		PERCENT					
Least Influence	0	7.57	2.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1	1.62	2.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00
	2	4.32	11.22	9.76	8.33	0.00	0.00
	3	10.27	5.10	7.32	8.33	27.27	0.00
	4	10.82	21.43	26.82	16.67	13.64	25.00
	5	24.32	28.57	36.59	50.00	40.91	0.00
Most Influence	6	41.08	29.60	19.51	16.67	18.18	50.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 50.81644

DF = 30

P < .05

TABLE 60. (Questions 27 and 51)--Influence of Divine Call on Decision to Enter Seminary, According to Sureness of Ministry as Life Work

Extent of Influence		Sureness of Ministry					Other (N=5)
		Very Sure (N=185)	Somewhat Sure (N=97)	Undecided (N=41)	Somewhat Unsure (N=12)	Very Unsure (N=21)	
PERCENT							
Least Influence	0	1.62	6.19	12.20	0.00	28.57	20.00
	1	1.62	11.34	4.87	16.67	9.52	0.00
	2	2.16	9.28	17.07	25.00	4.76	20.00
	3	5.41	3.09	9.76	16.67	19.05	0.00
	4	7.03	10.31	14.63	8.33	0.00	0.00
	5	14.59	14.43	29.27	0.00	14.29	40.00
Most Influence	6	67.57	45.36	12.20	33.33	23.81	20.00
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Chi-square = 115.42287

DF = 30

P < .01

TABLE 61. (Questions 2 and 9)--Present Marital State, According to Class in Seminary

Marital State	1st Year (N=138)	Class in Seminary		3rd Year (N=60)	4th Year (N=48)
		2nd Year (N=115)	PERCENT		
Never Married	41.30	38.26		25.00	25.00
Engaged	10.14	5.22		1.66	2.10
Married	47.84	55.65		71.67	70.80
Separated	0.00	0.00		0.00	2.10
Divorced	0.00	0.87		1.67	0.00
Widowed	0.72	0.00		0.00	0.00
Remarried	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00		100.00	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 28.59610$$

$$DF = 15$$

$$P < .05$$

TABLE 62. (Questions 2 and 13)--Doctrinal Position, According to Class in Seminary

Doctrinal Position	Class in Seminary			
	1st Year (N=134)	2nd Year (N=115)	3rd Year (N=60)	4th Year (N=47)
	PERCENT			
Liberal	22.39	24.35	18.33	38.30
Conservative	60.45	48.70	56.67	14.90
Middle of the Road	17.16	26.95	25.00	46.80
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 32.01505$$

$$DF = 6$$

$$P < .01$$

TABLE 63. (Question 26 and 29a)--Participation in Church Activities While in College, According to Age of Decision to Study for the Ministry

Extent of Participation	Age of Decision						Other (N=8)
	Before 10 (N=8)	10-13 (N=23)	During High School (N=81)	During College (N=174)	After College (N=26)	Between High School and College (N=9)	
	PERCENT						
Very Much	37.50	34.79	37.04	27.59	17.50	66.67	25.00
Moderately	50.00	30.43	25.92	30.46	20.00	11.11	37.50
Slightly	12.50	30.43	29.63	32.18	17.50	22.22	25.00
Not at All	0.00	4.35	7.41	9.77	10.00	0.00	12.50
No Response					35.00		
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 126.29105$$

$$DF = 28$$

$$P < .01$$

TABLE 64. (Questions 27 and 29a)--Participation in Church Activities While in College, According to Sureness of Ministry as Life Work

Extent of Participation	Sureness of Ministry					Other (N=5)
	Very Sure (N=184)	Somewhat Sure (N=95)	Undecided (N=40)	Somewhat Unsure (N=12)	Very Unsure (N=22)	
			PERCENT			
Very Much	37.50	21.05	20.00	16.67	22.73	40.00
Moderately	29.89	33.69	20.00	25.00	22.73	20.00
Slightly	25.00	40.00	45.00	33.33	31.81	20.00
Not at All	7.61	5.26	15.00	25.00	22.73	20.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

$$\chi^2 = 29.59073$$

$$DF = 15$$

$$P < .05$$

APPENDIX C

Adapted from Haller and Miller, Occupational Aspiration Scale, Table 1, pp. 41-43.

TABLE 1-Summary of the relation between the Ministerial Occupational prestige scores and the OAS format.

Ministerial Occupation Rankings				OAS
Occupation	Score	Item	Question	Score

Table 2-OAS format: Combination of expression levels and goal-periods for each of the four question-wordings. (from Haller and Miller, Table 2, p. 43)

Expression levels	Goal-Periods	
	Short-range (S) (a)	Long-range (L) (b)
Idealistic (I)	of the jobs listed in this question, which ONE would you choose if you were FREE TO CHOOSE ANY of them you wished when your SCHOOLING IS OVER? (2 & 4)	of the jobs listed in this question, which ONE would you choose to have when you are 30 YEARS OLD, if you were FREE TO HAVE ANY of them you wished? (6 & 8)
Realistic (R)	of the jobs listed in this question, which is the BEST one you are REALLY SURE YOU CAN GET when your SCHOOLING IS OVER? (1 & 3)	of the jobs listed in this question, which is the BEST ONE you are REALLY SURE YOU CAN HAVE by the time you are 30 YEARS OLD? (5 & 7)

(a) Initial Career-Point (b) Mature Career-Point

TABLE 3-OAS FORMAT: Distribution of Ministerial Occupations among the OAS items.

Ministerial Occupations	OAS items							
(High prestige)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	9							
2		9						
3			9					
4				9				
5					9			
6						9		
7							9	
8								9
73	0							
74		0						
75			0					
76				0				
77					0			
78						0		
79							0	
80								0

adapted from Haller and Miller, Table 3, p. 46.

"The occupational titles were systematically selected from the 90 occupations ranked by the NORC study. This selection was done in a way which makes sure that the response alternatives for each stimulus question span the entire range of the prestige hierarchy or continuum of difficulty. The highest occupation in prestige was assigned to Question 1, the second highest to Question 2, and so on down to the 80th which was assigned to Question 8. While each set of alternatives does not span the same area of prestige ratings, they do tend to span almost the same range of occupational prestige. The equality of ranges is only approximated because several of the occupations in the NORC ratings have the same average prestige score.

On the OAS form the prestige ranks for each set of 10 alternatives were placed in a non-hierarchical distribution to insure that the order of presentation would not correspond to the order of prestige."

Haller and Miller, Table 3, and pp. 45-46.

Ministerial Occupational Rankings

<u>Occupational Specialization</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Category and Item</u>	<u>Question and Item</u>
1. Professor in a theological seminary	85	1:1	51-1:6
2. Professor in a college	84 (83:58)		
3. Professor in a church-related college	83 (83:45)		
4. Foreign missionary	82	1:2	52-2:5
5. Bishop	81 (80:634)	1:3	53-3:6
6. Administrator of a home for mentally retarded children	80 (80.426)		
7. Pastor of an inner city church	79 (79.06)	1:4	54-4:6
8. Teacher in a theological seminary	78 (78.30)		
9. Chaplain of a home for mentally retarded children	78 (78.17)	1:5	55-5:6
10. Pastor to a narcotics' halfway house	78 (77.80)	1:6	56-6:6
11. Synod president	78 (77.64)		
12. Administrator of a council of churches	77 (77.18)	1:7	57-7:6
13. President of a denomination	77 (77.188)	1:8	58-8:6
14. Director of youth work	77 (77.16)	2:1	51-1:4
15. Prison chaplain	77 (76.95)	2:2	52-2:4

<u>Occupational Specialization</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Category and Item</u>	<u>Question and Item</u>
16. Administrator of a school for the deaf	77 (76.88)		
17. University chaplain	77 (76.84)		
18. Chaplain of a school for the blind	77 (77.43)	2:3	53-3:4
19. Chaplain of a school for the deaf	77 (77.42)	2:4	54-4:4
20. Administrator of a school for the blind	77 (77.32)		
21. Pastor to a leper colony	76 (76.45)	2:5	55-5:4
22. Pastor to a prisoners' halfway house	76 (76.30)	2:6	56-6:4
23. Teacher in a college	76 (75.91)		
24. Chaplain of a children's home	75 (75.37)	2:7	57-7:4
25. Teacher in a church-related college	75 (75.18)		
26. Armed services chaplain	75 (75.13)	2:8	58-8:4
27. Pastor of a town and country church	75 (74.99)	3:1	51-1:8
28. Social worker in case work	75 (74.72)		
29. Director of counseling	75 (74.53)	3:2	52-2:8
30. Executive of denominational board of world missions	74 (74.27)	3:3	53-3:8
31. Pastor of a counseling center	74 (74.02)	3:4	54-4:8

<u>Occupational Specialization</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Category and Item</u>	<u>Question and Item</u>
32. Director of religious affairs in a university	74 (73.75)	3:5	55-5:8
33. College chaplain	74 (73.68)	3:6	56-6:8
34. City missionary	74 (73.54)		
35. Executive for a denominational board for interchurch relations	73 (73.00)	3:7	57-7:8
36. Social worker in group work	73 (72.81)		
37. Administrator of a children's home	73 (72.70)		
38. Pastor of a suburban church	73 (72.67)	3:8	58-8:8
39. Worker priest	72 (72.33)	4:1	51-1:2
40. Administrator of a civil rights organization	72 (72.00)		
41. Director of religious education	72 (72.07)	4:2	52-2:2
42. Pastor to a racial group	72 (71.93)	4:3	53-3:2
43. Executive for a denominational board of American missions	72 (71.89)	4:4	54-4:2
44. Executive of denominational board for youth ministry	72 (71.76)	4:5	55-5:2
45. Instructor in a theological seminary	72 (71.72)	4:6	56-6:2
46. Pastor of a downtown church	72 (71.60)	4:7	57-7:2
47. Executive of a denominational board of theological education	71 (71.27)	4:8	58-8:2

<u>Occupational Specialization</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Category and Item</u>	<u>Question and Item</u>
48. Administrator of a migrant workers' center	71 (71.26)		
49. Executive of a denominational board of social ministry	71 (71.23)	5:1	51-1:5
50. Chaplain to a retirement center	71 (71.05)	5:2	52-2:5
51. Hospital chaplain	71 (70.89)	5:3	53-3:5
52. Pastor to an ethnic group	71 (70.64)	5:4	54-4:5
53. Instructor in a college	70 (69.90)		
54. Instructor in a church-related college	70 (69.58)		
55. Associate pastor of an urban church	70 (69.53)	5:5	55-5:5
56. Executive of a denominational board for church vocations	70 (69.50)	5:6	56-6:5
57. Executive of a denominational board of parish education	69 (69.15)	5:7	57-7:5
58. Assistant pastor of an inner city church	69 (69.04)	5:8	58-8:5
59. Director for community organization	69 (68.72)	6:1	51-1:7
60. Veterans' chaplain	68 (68.44)	6:2	52-2:7
61. Executive of a board for evangelism of a denomination	68 (68.29)	6:3	53-3:7
62. Moderator of a presbytery	68 (67.76)		
63. Administrator of a denominational high school	67 (67.19)		

<u>Occupational Specialization</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Category and Item</u>	<u>Question and Item</u>
64. Executive of a denominational board for stewardship	67 (66.78)	6:4	54-4:7
65. Pastor to seamen (seamen's chaplain)	67 (66.73)	6:5	55-5:7
66. Administrator of a parochial elementary school	66 (66.26)		
67. Assistant pastor of an urban church	66 (66.23)	6:6	56-6:7
68. Executive of a denominational board of press, radio, and TV	66 (65.94)	6:7	57-7:7
69. Editor of a theological journal	66 (65.74)		
70. Evangelist	66 (65.70)	6:8	58-8:7
71. Editor of a religious magazine	66 (65.64)		
72. Administrator of a deaconness training school	65 (64.86)	7:1	51-1:1
73. Assistant to the bishop	65 (64.58)		
74. Associate pastor of a town and country church	64 (64.34)	7:2	52-2:1
75. Industrial chaplain	64 (64.27)	7:3	53-3:1
76. Assistant pastor of a downtown church	64 (63.98)	7:4	54-4:1
77. Pastor to night people	64 (63.93)	7:5	55-5:1
78. Associate pastor of a suburban church	64 (63.83)	7:6	56-6:1
79. Television pastor	64 (63.77)	7:7	57-7:1

<u>Occupational Specialization</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Category and Item</u>	<u>Question and Item</u>
80. Assistant pastor of a suburban church	64 (63.66)	7:8	58-8:1
81. Assistant pastor of a town and country church	63 (62.83)	8:1	51-1:3
82. Pastor of a coffee house	62 (62.30)	8:2	52-2:3
83. Executive of a denominational subdivision (sub-part)	62 (62.25)		
84. Editor of religious news	62 (61.62)		
85. Pastor to high-rise apartments	62 (61.55)	8:3	53-3:3
86. Radio pastor	62 (62.50)	8:4	54-4:3
87. Chaplain of a seamen's home	61 (61.30)	8:5	55-5:3
88. Pastor to jazz artists	61 (60.89)	8:6	56-6:3
89. Administrator of a church camp	61 (60.73)		
90. Director of music	60 (60.32)		
91. Administrator of a retirement home	60 (59.99)		
92. Pastor to race track people	58 (57.502)	8:7	57-7:3
93. Assistant to the executive of a denominational subdivision (sub-part)	57 (56.88)		
94. Administrator of a seamen's center	57 (56.74)		

<u>Occupational Specialization</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Category and Item</u>	<u>Question and Item</u>
95. Administrator of a seamen's home	56 (56.41)		
96. Pastor to a shopping center	46 (45.96)	8:3	58-8:3

Questionnaire

This set of questions deals with your interest in different types of ministerial occupations. Circle the number of your choice for each of the following questions.

53. Of the jobs listed, which is the BEST ONE you are really SURE YOU CAN GET when your education is completed?

1.1.....

54. Of the jobs listed in this question, which ONE would you choose if you were FREE to CHOOSE ANY of them you wanted when your education is completed?

2.1.....

55. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the BEST ONE you are REALLY SURE YOU CAN GET when your SCHOOLING IS OVER?

3.1.....

56. Of the jobs listed in this question, which ONE would you choose if you were FREE TO CHOOSE ANY of them you wished when your SCHOOLING IS OVER?

4.1.....

57. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the BEST ONE you are REALLY SURE YOU CAN HAVE ten years after you have completed your schooling?

5.1.....

58. Of the jobs listed in this question, which ONE would you choose to have ten years after you have completed your schooling?

6.1.....

59. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the BEST ONE you are REALLY SURE YOU CAN HAVE ten years after completing your schooling?

7.1.....

60. Of the jobs listed in this question, which ONE would you choose to have ten years after completing your education, if you were FREE TO HAVE ANY OF THEM YOU WISHED?

8.1.....

APPENDIX D

OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALIZATION ASPIRATIONS WHEN GRADUATED

54. Of the jobs listed in this question, which one would you choose if you were free to choose any of them you wanted when your seminary training is completed? Circle the number which applies.

56. Of the jobs listed in this question, which one would you choose if you were free to choose any of them you wished when your seminary training is over? Circle the number which applies.

- 118 associate pastor of a town and country church or parish
- 112 assistant pastor of a downtown church, congregation, or parish
- 85 pastor of a counseling center
- 82 pastor of an inner city church, congregation, or parish
- 67 foreign missionary
- 66 director of counseling in a local congregation or parish
- 38 director of religious education in a local congregation or parish
- 37 pastor of a coffee house
- 25 pastor to an ethnic group
- 23 radio pastor
- 15 prison chaplain
- 9 executive of a denominational board of American missions
- 6 executive of a denominational board of stewardship
- 5 veterans' chaplain
- 2 chaplain of a retirement center
- 2 chaplain of a school for the deaf

OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALIZATION ASPIRATIONS TEN YEARS AFTER GRADUATION

58. Of the jobs listed in this question, which one would you choose to have ten years after you have completed your seminary training, if you were free to have any of them you wished?

60. Of the jobs listed in this question, which one would you choose to have ten years after you have completed your seminary training, if you were free to have any of them you wished?

137 pastor of a suburban church

98 instructor in a theological seminary

87 college chaplain

81 associate pastor of a suburban church, congregation, or parish

46 assistant pastor of an inner city church, congregation, or parish

45 executive of a denominational board of theological education

35 evangelist

30 president of a denomination

26 assistant pastor of an urban church, congregation, or parish

22 chaplain in the armed services

22 assistant pastor of a suburban church, congregation, or parish

18 pastor to a prisoners' halfway house

17 pastor to a narcotics' halfway house

15 pastor to a shopping center

12 executive of a denominational board for church vocations

8 pastor to jazz artists

OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALIZATION EXPECTATIONS WHEN GRADUATED

53. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the best one you are really sure you can get when your seminary training is completed?
55. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the best one you are really sure you can get when your seminary training is completed?

- 199 pastor of a town and country church or parish
- 81 pastor to a racial group
- 81 hospital chaplain
- 68 pastor to high-rise apartments
- 45 director of youth work in a congregation, church, or parish
- 44 assistant pastor of a town and country church or parish
- 33 industrial chaplain
- 21 worker priest
- 20 director for community organization in a local church, congregation, or parish
- 18 bishop
- 14 executive of a denominational board of world missions
- 13 executive of a denominational board of evangelism
- 12 chaplain of a school for the blind
- 12 professor in a theological seminary
- 3 executive of a denominational board of social ministry
- 1 administrator of a deaconness' or parish workers' training school

OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALIZATION EXPECTATIONS TEN YEARS AFTER GRADUATION

57. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the best one you are really sure you can have ten years after you have completed your seminary training?
59. Of the jobs listed in this question, which is the best one you are really sure you can have ten years after completing your seminary training?
- 201 pastor of a downtown church, congregation or parish
- 129 associate pastor of an urban church
- 87 director of religious affairs of a university
- 66 executive of a denominational board of youth ministry
- 50 chaplain of a children's home
- 31 pastor to night people
- 31 executive of a denominational board of parish education
- 19 executive of a denominational board of interchurch relations
- 15 executive of a denominational board of press, radio, and television
- 10 chaplain of a home for mentally retarded children
- 8 television pastor
- 8 pastor to a leper colony
- 8 administrator of a council of churches
- 6 pastor to seamen (seamen's chaplain)
- 5 pastor to race track people
- 0 chaplain of a seamen's home

RANK ORDER OF OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALIZATIONS

- 201 pastor of a downtown church, congregation or parish
- 199 pastor of a town and country church or parish
- 137 pastor of a suburban church
- 129 associate pastor of an urban church
- 118 associate pastor of a town and country church or parish
- 112 assistant pastor of a downtown church, congregation, or parish
- 98 instructor in a theological seminary
- 87 director of religious affairs of a university
- 87 college chaplain
- 85 pastor of a counseling center
- 82 pastor of an inner city, church, congregation, or parish
- 81 pastor to a racial group
- 81 hospital chaplain
- 81 associate pastor of a suburban church, congregation, or parish
- 68 pastor to high-rise apartments
- 67 foreign missionary
- 66 director of counseling in a local congregation or parish
- 66 executive of a denominational board of youth ministry
- 50 chaplain of a children's home
- 46 assistant pastor of an inner city church, congregation, or parish
- 45 director of youth work in a congregation, church, or parish
- 45 executive of a denominational board of theological education
- 44 assistant pastor of a town and country church or parish
- 38 director of religious education in a local congregation or parish
- 37 pastor of a coffee house

- 35 evangelist
- 33 industrial chaplain
- 31 pastor to night people
- 31 executive of a denominational board of parish education
- 30 president of a denomination
- 26 assistant pastor of an urban church, congregation, or parish
- 25 pastor to an ethnic group
- 23 radio pastor
- 22 assistant pastor of a suburban church, congregation, or parish
- 22 chaplain in the armed services
- 21 worker priest
- 20 director for community organization in a local church, congregation, or parish
- 19 executive of a denominational board of interchurch relations
- 18 bishop
- 18 pastor to a prisoners' halfway house
- 17 pastor to a narcotics' halfway house
- 15 prison chaplain
- 15 executive of a denominational board of press, radio, and television
- 15 pastor to a shopping center
- 14 executive of a denominational board of world missions
- 13 executive of a denominational board of evangelism
- 12 professor in a theological seminary
- 12 chaplain of a school for the blind
- 12 executive of a denominational board for church vocations
- 10 chaplain of a home for mentally retarded children
- 9 executive of a denominational board of American missions

- 8 pastor to a leper colony
- 8 television pastor
- 8 administrator of a council of churches
- 8 pastor to jazz artists
- 6 executive of a denominational board of stewardship
- 6 pastor to seamen (seamen's chaplain)
- 5 veterans' chaplain
- 5 pastor to race track people
- 3 executive of a denominational board of social ministry
- 2 chaplain of a retirement center
- 2 chaplain of a school for the deaf
- 1 administrator of a deaconness' or parish workers' training school
- 0 chaplain of a seamen's home